



Consolidated State Application

for State Grants under Title IX, Part C, Section 9302 of the Elementary and
Secondary Education Act (Public Law 107-110)

Submitted June 11, 2002

Updated June 28, 2002

Approved by the U.S. Department of Education July 2, 2002

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | <u>PAGE</u> |
|--|---------------|
| Consolidated State Application Signature Page..... | i |
| Safe and Drug Free Schools and Communities Act Chief Executive Officer Cover Sheet..... | ii |
| ESEA Programs Included in the Consolidated State Application Checklist..... | iii |
| State Contacts for ESEA Programs..... | iv |
| Consolidated State Application Contents | |
| Part I: ESEA Goals, Indicators and Performance Targets..... | 1 |
| Part II: State Activities to Implement ESEA Programs..... | 4 |
| Part III: ESEA Key Programmatic Requirements and Fiscal Information..... | 37 |
| GEPA statement..... | 62 |
| Assurances and Certifications..... | 64 |
| Appendixes | |
| Appendix A Abbreviations and Acronyms..... | 73 |
| Appendix B Links..... | 75 |
| Appendix C Fiscal Awards..... | 76 |

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION - SIGNATURE PAGE

The State of Michigan hereby requests funds as authorized by section 9302 of the ESEA for the programs selected and identified on the “List of Programs Included in this Consolidated Application.”

| | |
|---|---|
| 1. Legal name of Applicant Agency (State Educational Agency): Michigan Department of Education | 2. D.U.N.S. number: 805 336 641 Taxpayer ID Number (TIN): 38 6000134 |
| 3. Address (include zip): Michigan Department of Education Hannah Building, Fourth Floor 608 West Allegan Street P.O. Box 30008 Lansing, Michigan 48909 | 4. Contact Person for Consolidated Application Name: Mary Ann Chartrand Position: Supervisor, Grants Administration and Coordination Telephone: 517-378-1806 Fax: 517-241-0496 E-Mail: ChartrandM@Michigan.gov |
| 5. Is the applicant delinquent on any Federal debt? _____√_____ No _____ Yes, explanation attached. | |
| 6. By signing this consolidated State application, the State certifies the following: a. The following assurances and certifications covering the programs included in this Consolidated State Application have been filed with the U.S. Department of Education (either as a part of this Application or through another submission from the State): i. <u>Section 14303 and EDGAR.</u> The assurances in Section 9304 (a) of the ESEA, and Section 76.104 of the Education Department General Administrative Regulations (EDGAR) ii. <u>ESEA Program Assurances.</u> Any assurances or certifications included in the statutes governing any program included in this Application. iii. <u>Assurances and Certifications.</u> Any assurances or certifications included in the Application under "Assurances and Certifications." iv. <u>Crosscutting.</u> As applicable, the assurances in OMB Standard Form 424B (Government-wide Assurances for Non-Construction Programs). v. <u>Lobbying; debarment/suspension; drug-free workplace.</u> The three certifications in ED Form 80-0013 and 80-0014, relating to lobbying, debarment/suspension, and drug-free workplace. (For more information, see 61 <i>Fed. Reg.</i> 1412 (01.19.96).) b. As of the date of submission of this Application, none of the facts have changed upon which those certifications and assurances were made. | |
| 7. To the best of my knowledge and belief, all data are true and correct. The governing body of the applicant has duly authorized the document and the applicant will comply with the assurances and certifications provided in this package if the assistance is awarded. | |
| a. Printed Name and Title of Authorized State/SEA Representative: Thomas D Watkins, Jr. Superintendent of Public Instruction | b. Telephone: 517-373-9235 Fax: 517-335-4565 E-Mail: Watkinstd@michigan.gov |
| c. Signature of Authorized State/SEA Representative: <i>Signed form sent UPS overnight 6-11-02</i> | d. Date: June 11, 2002 |

SAFE DRUG-FREE SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITIES ACT STATE GRANTS

Chief Executive Officer Cover Sheet

| | |
|---|---|
| 1. Legal Name of Applicant Agency (Chief Executive Office): Office of the Governor State of Michigan | 2. DUNS Number: 177682655 |
| 3. Address (including zip code): Craig J. Yaldo, Director Michigan Office of Drug Control Policy 320 S. Walnut, 2 nd Floor Lansing, MI 48913 | 4. Contact Person Name: Judith M. Pasquarella Position: Manager, Education Section Telephone: 517-373-4700 Fax: 517-335-2121 E-Mail Address: pasquarellaj@michigan.gov |
| 5. Reservation of Funds: <u>20%</u> Indicate the amount the Governor wishes to reserve (up to 20%) of the total State SDFSCA State Grant allocation. | |
| 6. By signing this form the Governor certifies the following: a. The following assurances and certifications covering the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act State Grants program have been filed with the U.S. Department of Education (either as a part of this Application or through another submission from the State): i. <u>Section 14303 and EDGAR</u> . The assurances in Section 9304(a) of the ESEA, and Section 76.104 of the Education Department General Administrative Regulations (EDGAR). ii. <u>ESEA Program Assurances</u> . Any assurances or certifications included in the statutes governing the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act State Grants program. iii. <u>Assurances and Certification</u> . Any assurances or certifications included in the Application under "Assurances and Certifications." iv. <u>Cross-Cutting</u> . As applicable, the assurances in OMB Standard Form 424B (Government-wide Assurances for Non-Construction Programs.)v. <u>Lobbying; debarment/suspension; drug-free workplace</u> . The three certification in ED Form 80-0013 and 80-0014, relating to lobbying, debarment/suspension, and drug-free workplace. (For more information, see 61 <i>Fed. Reg.</i> 1412 (01.19.96.) b. As of the date of submission of this Application, none of the facts has changed upon which those certifications and assurances were made. | |
| 7. To the best of my knowledge and belief, all data are true and correct. The governing body of the applicant has duly authorized the document and the applicant will comply with the assurances and certification provided in this package if the assistance is awarded. | |
| 8. Typed name of Chief Executive Officer John Engler Governor | 9. Telephone Number: (517)373-3400 |
| 10. Signature of Chief Executive Officer <i>Signed form sent UPS overnight 6-11-02</i> | 11. Date June 10, 2002 |

**ESEA PROGRAMS INCLUDED IN
THE CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION**

The State of Michigan requests funds for the programs indicated below:

- ☒ Title I, Part A: Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Educational Agencies
- ☒ Title I, Part B, Subpart 3: Even Start Family Literacy
- ☒ Title I, Part C: Education of Migrant Children
- ☒ Title I, Part D: Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk
- ☒ Title I, Part F: Comprehensive School Reform
- ☒ Title II, Part A: Teacher and Principal Training and Recruiting Fund
- ☒ Title II, Part D: Enhancing Education Through Technology
- ☒ Title III, Part A: English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement
- ☒ Title IV, Part A, Subpart 1: Safe and Drug Free Schools and Communities
- ☒ Title IV, Part A, Subpart 2: Community Service Grants
- ☒ Title IV, Part B: 21st Century Community Learning Centers
- ☒ Title V, Part A: Innovative Programs
- ☒ Title VI, Part A, Subpart 1, Section 6111: State Assessment Program
- ☒ Title VI, Part A, Subpart 1, Section 6112: Enhanced Assessment Instruments Competitive Grant Program
- ☒ Title VI, Part B, Subpart 2: Rural and Low-Income Schools

STATE CONTACTS FOR ESEA PROGRAMS

| ESEA Program | Contact |
|--------------------------------------|---|
| Title I, Part A | Linda Brown |
| Title I, Part B, 3 | Renee Demars-Johnson |
| Title I, Part C | MaryAlice Galloway Dorothy VanLooy |
| Title I, Part D | Linda Brown |
| Title I, Part F | MaryAlice Galloway Dorothy VanLooy |
| Title II, Part A | Linda Brown Carolyn Logan |
| Title II, Part D | Mary Ann Chartrand (competitive) Linda Brown (formula) |
| Title III, Part A | MaryAlice Galloway Dorothy VanLooy |
| Title IV, Part A (SEA) | Judith Pasquarella |
| Title IV, Part A (Governor) | Judith Pasquarella |
| Title IV, Part A, Subpart 2 | Judith Pasquarella |
| Title IV, Part B | Lindy Buch |
| Title V, Part A | Linda Brown (formula) Mary Ann Chartrand (state activities) |
| Title VI, Part A, Subpart 1, 6111 | Jeremy Hughes (MEAP) Jacquelyn Thompson (MI-Access) |
| Title VI, Part A, Subpart 1, 6112 | Jeremy Hughes (MEAP) Jacquelyn Thompson (MI-Access) |
| Title VI, Part B, Subpart 2 | Linda Brown |

**NO CHILD LEFT BEHIND ACT OF 2001
Consolidated State Application**

**PART I: ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT (ESEA)
GOALS, ESEA INDICATORS, STATE PERFORMANCE TARGETS**

The Michigan Department of Education (MDE) hereby assures that it has adopted the following five performance goals and corresponding performance indicators as required by the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) act of 2001. MDE will submit the performance targets and baseline data related to the goals to the U.S. Department of Education (US ED) by May 1, 2003.

ESEA Goals and Indicators

1. **Performance goal 1:** By 2013-2014, all students will reach high standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.
 - 1.1. Performance indicator: The percentage of students, in the aggregate and for each subgroup specified in section 1111(h)(1)(C)(i), who are at or above the proficient level in reading/language arts on the State's assessment.
 - 1.2. Performance indicator: The percentage of students, in the aggregate and in each subgroup specified in 1111(h)(1)(C)(i), who are at or above the proficient level in mathematics on the State's assessment.
 - 1.3. Performance indicator: The percentage of Title I schools that make adequate yearly progress.
2. **Performance goal 2:** All limited English proficient students will become proficient in English and reach high academic standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.
 - 2.1. Performance indicator: The percentage of limited English proficient students, determined by cohort, who have attained English proficiency by the end of the school year.
 - 2.2. Performance indicator: The percentage of limited English proficient students who are at or above the proficient level in reading/language arts on the State's assessment, as reported for performance indicator 1.1.
 - 2.3. Performance indicator: The percentage of limited English proficient students who are at or above the proficient level in mathematics on the State's assessment, as reported for performance indicator 1.2.
3. **Performance goal 3:** By 2005-2006, all students will be taught by highly qualified teachers.
 - 3.1. Performance indicator: The percentage of classes being taught by "highly qualified" teachers (as the term is defined in section 9101(23) of the ESEA), in

- the aggregate and in “high-poverty” schools (as the term is defined in section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) of the ESEA).
- 3.2. Performance indicator: The percentage of teachers receiving high-quality professional development (as the term, “professional development,” is defined in section 9101(34).
 - 3.3. Performance indicator: The percentage of paraprofessionals (excluding those with sole duties as translators and parental involvement assistants) who are qualified as specified in section 1119(c) and (d).
4. **Performance goal 4:** All students will be educated in learning environments that are safe, drug free, and conducive to learning.
 - 4.1. Performance indicator: The number of persistently dangerous schools, as defined by the State, as identified in section 9532 (a).
 5. **Performance goal 5:** All students will graduate from high school.
 - 5.1. Performance indicator: The percentage of students who graduate from high school each year with a regular diploma, disaggregated by race, ethnicity, gender, disability status, migrant status, English proficiency, and status as economically disadvantaged; and calculated in the same manner as used in National Center for Education Statistics reports on Common Core of Data, or by any other method approved by the US ED.
 - 5.2. Performance indicator: The percentage of students who drop out of school, disaggregated by race, ethnicity, gender, disability status, migrant status, English proficiency, and status as economically disadvantaged; and calculated in the same manner as used in National Center for Education Statistics reports on Common Core of Data, or by any other method approved by the US ED.

The Center for Educational Performance and Information (CEPI) has been charged by the Governor as the sole repository of all educational data for Michigan. Each of the above five performance goals will use data provided by CEPI.

CEPI has created the Michigan Education Information System (MEIS). The MEIS Data Warehouse was initiated by CEPI as a thoughtful effort to move Michigan’s information management system into the 21st century. Its purpose is to develop a uniform information management and reporting system for the educational community that would gather school data via the Internet, manage the information on a reliable and powerful data warehouse, and make the data readily accessible to policy makers. The MEIS Warehouse initially contains five data sets. These core data sets include:

1. Single Record Student Database (SRSD). Typical data fields in this act include: date of exit and reason; grade; program; unique identification number; and all limited English proficient, Migrant, and Special Education elements.

2. Student Test and Achievement Repository (STAR). This is a data set storing student performance data that results from the Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP), General Education Diploma (GED), Advanced Placement, American College Test (ACT), and Preliminary Scholastic Aptitude Test (PSAT).
3. School Infrastructure Database (SID). Data fields in this data set relate to building construction, number of classrooms, age of computers, connectivity, crime/safety, and civil rights elements.
4. Registry of Educational Personnel (REP). Typical data fields include: degree held, certification, assignment by grade level, salary, percent employed, professional development participation and paraprofessional elements.
5. Financial Information Database (FID). This is a comprehensive financial database, which includes balance sheet, revenue, district expenditure, and building expenditure information.

These core data sets will be referred to throughout this application.

PART II: STATE ACTIVITIES TO IMPLEMENT ESEA PROGRAMS

1. Describe the State's system of standards, assessments, and accountability and provide evidence that it meets the requirements of the ESEA. In doing so –
 - a. In the **June 2002 submission**, provide a timeline of major milestones, for either: adopting challenging content standards in reading/language arts and mathematics at each grade level for grades 3 through 8, consistent with section 1111(b)(1) or disseminating grade-level expectations for reading/English language arts and mathematics for grades 3 through 8 to local education agencies (LEAs), i.e. local and intermediate school districts and public school academies and schools if the State's academic content standards cover more than one grade level.

In 1995, the State Board of Education adopted the model content standards for English language arts, social studies, mathematics, and science. In addition to the core academic content standards, the State adopted in 1998 content standards in the areas of career and employability skills, physical education, technology, health education, arts education, world languages, and life management education.

Furthermore, "benchmarks" in each of the content areas have been developed to clarify the content standards as to what students should know and be able to do at various developmental levels (elementary, middle, and high school). The standards and benchmarks serve two purposes: (1) they are a guide to local districts and schools in developing curriculum that is aligned to the standards and benchmarks, and (2) they are the basis upon which the Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP) tests (in reading, writing, mathematics, science, and social studies) are developed and administered to all students in Grades 4, 5, 7, 8, and 11.

They also are the basis for MI-Access, Michigan's Alternate Assessment Program, assessments for students with disabilities. The Phase 1 MI-Access assessment for students with severe and moderate cognitive impairments reflects all of the core and non-core content standards except world languages. The Phase 2 MI-Access reading/English language arts and mathematics assessments will be based on the English language arts and mathematics content standards. The Functional Independence in Adult Life Roles MI-Access assessments will reflect all of the non-core content standards except world languages.

A process is being instituted which will align the assessment of benchmarks by grade level. This process involves the following timeline:

| Timeline | Activity |
|------------------------|--|
| April 2002 | A letter was sent to all Michigan school districts inviting districts or individual schools to send to the Office of Educational Assessment, documents from any local projects in which the benchmarks for reading/language arts and mathematics were aligned to specific grades or grade levels. |
| June 2002 | A group of educators will be convened for each of the two content areas to review the documents received from local districts and schools and to develop recommendations as to the specific grade levels at which specific benchmarks will be assessed with the tests to be developed. |
| August 2002 | A series of four or five regional meetings will be held throughout the state, to which interested educators and other parties will be invited, for the purpose of reviewing the recommended grade-level assignment of benchmarks developed by the summer work teams. |
| September-October 2002 | A group of subject-matter and assessment experts will be convened to review the recommendations of the summer work teams, as well as the comments and suggestions from the regional meetings. This group will make final recommendations to the Office of Educational Assessment. |
| November-December 2002 | A final document indicating at which grade levels specific reading/language arts and mathematics benchmarks will be assessed will be disseminated to school districts throughout the state. This document will form the basis for beginning to develop the grades 3-8 and high school the tests to be developed. |
| Spring 2003 | Test development will begin. |

- b. In the **June 2002 submission**, provide a timeline of major milestones, for adopting challenging academic content standards in science that meet the requirements of section 1111(b)(1).

In 1995, the Michigan Board of Education adopted challenging K-12 content standards in science that meet the requirements of section 1111(b)(1). These academic content standards apply to all schools and children in the state. The standards and benchmarks for Science were revised in 2000. The standards describe what students are expected to know and be able to do. The standards are coherent and rigorous and encourage the teaching of advanced skills. These standards will be aligned to the state's academic content standards. The academic achievement standards will describe two levels of high achievement and a third level that provides complete information about the progress of lower-achieving students.

- c. In the **June 2002 submission**, provide a timeline of major milestones for the development and implementation, in consultation with LEAs, of assessments that meet the requirements of section 1111(b)(3) in the required subjects and grade levels.

The "benchmarks" described in the [Michigan Curriculum Framework](#), are not assigned to specific grade levels but are clustered by "early elementary," "later elementary," "middle school," and "high school." Also, the "benchmarks" do not include all cognitive functioning levels for students with disabilities. Developing assessments for grades 3-8 and for high school will require instituting a process by which the benchmarks can be assessed at precise grade levels and cognitive functioning level for Michigan's Alternate Assessment Program. This process has already begun and will be completed according to the following timeline.

Mathematics and Reading/English Language Arts

| Timeline | Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP) (Michigan Department of Treasury) | MI-Access Michigan's Alternate Assessment Program (Michigan Department of Education) |
|-----------------|---|---|
| Spring 2002 | <p>MEAP assesses students in the following content areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reading/English Language Arts in grades 4, 7, and 11 • Mathematics in grades 4, 8, and 11 • Science in grades 5, 8, and 11 • Social Studies in grades 5, 8, and 11 <p>A letter is being mailed to all local school districts inviting districts to send to the Michigan Department of Education (MDE) and the Michigan Department of Treasury (both agencies are collaborating on this project) copies of documents indicating how the districts may have aligned the benchmarks with specific grade levels. This information will be solicited for reading/language arts and mathematics.</p> | <p>MI-Access has a contract with Beck Evaluation and Testing Associates, Inc. (BETA) to assist MI-Access in the implementation of the current Phase 1 MI-Access assessments for students with severe and moderate cognitive impairments. BETA also has the contract to assist in the development of the Phase 2 proposed assessment plan or blueprint for assessing students with mild cognitive impairments in the content areas of English language arts, mathematics and functional independence in adult life roles. The Phase 2 assessments are being developed for grades 3–8 and grade 11. The subject area of science will be addressed at the same time as the new MEAP science assessments.</p> |
| Summer 2002 | <p>For English language arts and mathematics, a small team of teachers and other educators from the field will be convened to review the benchmark alignment information received from local districts. The product of this review will be a set of recommendations, for each content area, regarding the appropriate grade level at which to assess each benchmark.</p> | |
| Early Fall 2002 | <p>The recommendations from the above content area teams will be submitted for review to an advisory group of subject area and assessment experts, e.g., content area professional organizations and universities. Modifications may be made as a result of this process.</p> | <p>Field review and comment on the MI-Access proposed assessment plan in the content areas of mathematics, English language arts and functional independence for adult life roles will occur.</p> |

| | | |
|---------------------------|--|---|
| Late Fall 2002 | A final set of recommendations will be sent to each school district. The Michigan Departments of Treasury and Education will conduct regional meetings throughout the state, inviting representatives of interested districts, schools, and other persons to comment on the recommendations for assessing certain benchmarks at certain grade levels. Modifications may be made as a result of this process. | Compilation and analysis of field review and comment on the proposed assessment plan for the Phase 2 MI-Access assessments will be completed. The MI-Access Phase 2 Content Advisory Committee (CAC), the Sensitivity Review Committee (SRC), Alternate Assessment Advisory Committee (AAAC), and the MI-Access Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) will review comments. Revisions to the Phase 2 assessment plan, as needed, will be done. |
| School Year 2002-03 | A test development contractor will be employed to develop pilot assessments based on the recommended grade level alignment of benchmarks. Initial test development will focus on reading/language arts and mathematics. Test development will include not only new tests to cover those grade levels not currently included in the Michigan Educational Assessment Program (that is, grades 3 and 6) but may also include the revision of the current MEAP tests administered in grades 4, 5, 7, 8, and 11. The latter may be necessary because the current MEAP tests are cumulative; that is, the tests assess material covered in the grades leading up to the grade in which the actual testing occurs. Testing at every grade, 3-8 will allow content to be assessed that is more specific to each grade level. | MI-Access will conduct a <i>tryout</i> of the Phase 2 assessments during late spring 2003. |
| Summer 2003 | Content-area committees will be convened to review the proposed tests developed by the contractor. Modifications may be made as a result of this process. | CAC, SRC, AAAC, and MI- Access TAC will review pilot results and teacher feedback. Modifications, as needed, will be done. |
| School Year 2003-04 | Assessment tests in reading/language arts and mathematics will be piloted in selected school districts or schools. Districts or schools selected will reflect the geographic and demographic diversity of the State. | Phase 2 assessments will be piloted late spring 2004. |
| Spring 2004 | Results of the pilot testing will be reviewed and modifications made as needed. | |
| Summer 2004 | The proposed final versions of reading/language arts and mathematics tests will be submitted again for review by content area committees. | CAC, SRC, AAAC, and TAC will review tryout results and teacher MI-Access feedback. Modifications, as needed, will be done. |
| School Year 2004-05 | The reading/language arts and mathematics tests will be administered to all students in grades 3-8 and once at the high school level. | The Phase 2 MI-Access assessments in reading/English language arts, mathematics, and functional independence in adult life roles will be administered in grades 3-8 and once at the high school level. |

Science

| Timeline | Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP) | MI-Access Michigan's Alternate Assessment Program |
|---------------------|--|---|
| Summer 2005 | The MEAP currently has science assessment in place for grades 5, 8, and 11. MEAP plans on maintaining those assessments at those grades. | MI-Access science assessments will also be discussed by the above committees for students with severe, moderate, and mild cognitive impairments. A proposed assessment plan will be developed. |
| Fall 2006 | | Field review of proposed assessment plan for the MI-Access science assessments will occur. |
| Spring 2006 | | MI-Access science assessment tryout will take place. CAC, SRC AAAC, and MI-Access TAC will review tryout results and teacher feedback. |
| School Year 2006-07 | | MI-Access science assessments at a grade to be determined in the 3-5 grade level span, in the 6-9 grade level span, and in the 10-12 grade level span will be piloted. CAC, SRC, AAAC, and MI-Access TAC will review pilot results and teacher feedback. Modifications, as needed, will be done. |
| School Year 2007-08 | | The science tests will be administered to all students in grades 5, 8, and 11. |

- d. In the **June 2002 submission**, provide a timeline of major milestones for setting, in consultation with LEAs, academic achievement standards in mathematics, reading/language arts, and science that meet the requirements of section 1116(e)(6) and (7).

| Timeline | Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP) | MI-Access Michigan's Alternate Assessment Program |
|-----------------|---|--|
| Spring 2002 | A letter is being mailed to all local school districts inviting districts to send to the Michigan Department of Education and the Michigan Department of Treasury (both agencies are collaborating on this project) copies of documents indicating how the districts may have aligned the benchmarks with specific grade levels. This information will be solicited for reading/language arts, mathematics. | MI-Access Performance standard setting panels met April 2002. The panels made their recommendations to the MDE. The recommendations were reviewed and commented on by the Content Advisory Committee, the Sensitivity Review Committee and the Technical Advisory Committee. State Superintendent of Public Instruction approved the performance standards June 2002. |
| Summer 2002 | For each of the above content areas, a small team of teachers and other educators from the field will be convened to review the benchmark alignment information received from local districts. The product of this review will be a set of recommendations for each content area regarding the appropriate | |

| | | |
|--------------------|---|---|
| | grade level at which to test each benchmark. | |
| Early Fall 2002 | The recommendations from the above content area teams will be submitted for review to an advisory group of subject area and assessment experts, e.g., universities. Modifications may be made as a result of this process. | |
| Late Fall 2002 | <p>A final set of recommendations will be sent to each school district. The Michigan Departments of Treasury and Education will conduct regional meetings throughout the state, inviting interested districts, schools, and other persons to comment on the recommendations for assessing certain benchmarks at certain grade levels. Modifications may be made as a result of this process.</p> <p>As a result of this process, the MEAP tests will be revised to become the assessments required by NCLB in grades 3-8 and high school. These tests will be aligned with the Michigan Curriculum Framework and the standards and content area benchmarks described in this Framework.</p> | |
| Spring 2005 | | Performance Standard Setting panels will meet and provide the MDE with recommended performance standards for the Phase 2 MI-Access assessments in the areas of reading/English language arts, mathematics, and functional independence in adult life roles. |
| Spring 2008 | | Performance Standard Setting panels will meet and provide the MDE with recommended performance standards for the Phase 2 MI-Access assessments in the area of science. |

- e. A response to this question will be provided by January 31, 2003.
- f. A response to this question will be provided by January 31, 2003.
- g. A response to this question will be provided by January 31, 2003.
- h. In the **June 2002 submission**, provide a plan for how the State will implement a single accountability system that uses the same criteria, based primarily on assessments in Michigan's Educational Assessment System consistent with section 1111(b), for determining whether a school has made adequate yearly progress, regardless of whether the school receives Title I, Part A, or other federal funds.

Michigan continues to develop and fine-tune its accountability system. The State Board of Education has approved a specific plan for development, including a timetable that will result in the first public accountability report in December 2002. This plan will allow direct coordination of federal Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) measures in Michigan's accountability system. The Michigan State Board of Education has appointed an Accreditation Advisory Committee. The Committee has been charged to develop the linkage between the state accreditation system and NCLB, to assure that the federal requirements serve as the foundation for [Education YES!](#) This is the most important task before the Committee. Federal AYP requirements will be met through this linkage. This linkage will be in place by fall of 2002.

Note: As students are discussed throughout this document, the Michigan State Board of Education established the priority to improve achievement for ALL students. "All" means every student including migrant students, English language learners, students with disabilities, students of all races and backgrounds, gifted and talented students, as well as those from low-income families.

- i. In the **June 2002 submission**, identify the languages present in the student population to be assessed, the languages in which the State administers assessments, and the languages in which the State will need to administer assessments. Use the most recent data available and identify when the data were collected.

[The 2001-2002 Summary Language By Grade](#) is a report of languages present in Michigan schools. According to the report, Spanish is spoken by 45% and Arabic is spoken by 22% of the Limited English Proficient (LEP) student population. These languages will be reassessed in consultation with CEPI. After consultation with MEAP, an advisory group of practitioners, and the Students with Disabilities Assessment Advisory Committee, data will be accumulated by CEPI through the SRSD and studied by the MEAP staff during 2002-03 school year to determine if it is feasible and necessary to administer the MEAP and MI-Access assessments in a language other than English.

Additional information provided to the US ED:

The source of the data for the languages present in Michigan schools is obtained from districts during the annual Title VII Survey of Languages report. The Office of Field Services (OFS) is working with a Title III Advisory Group, which consists of representatives from school districts that have substantial LEP student populations, to plan for the implementation of Title III. Among the implementation issues under discussion is the need for assessments in languages other than English. We will examine student populations and assessment information and study the feasibility of creating and/or using assessments in other languages. LEP students comprise less than 4% of the student population in Michigan.

School districts are using the Single Record Student Database (SRSD) to record and track individual students. The SRSD contains "fields" for designating LEP and

immigrant status as well as fields for country of origin and language spoken. The data is reported and submitted to the state on three data collection dates throughout the school year. It is not just a static count taken at the beginning of the school year. That data will be used for Title III allocations and information collection including assessment information about students exiting from LEP status.

- j. In the **June 2002 submission**, provide evidence that, beginning not later than the school year 2002-2003, LEAs will provide for an annual assessment of English proficiency that meets the requirements of section 1111(b)(7) and 3116(d)(4), including assessment of English proficiency in speaking, listening, reading, writing, and comprehension. Identify the assessment(s) the State will designate for this purpose.

LEAs currently use a variety of nationally normed English language proficiency (ELP) assessments in response to state bilingual requirements to measure ELP using an oral proficiency or reading proficiency assessment. MDE intends to apply for a Title VI, Section 6112 grant, Enhanced Assessment Instruments Competitive Grant Program, and work in partnership with the MEAP office to develop a statewide assessment for LEP students to measure English language development. It is the intent of the MDE to explore the feasibility of developing an assessment that will serve the dual purpose of measuring English language proficiency and English language arts skills.

Additional information provided to the US ED:

LEAs that currently assess for English language proficiency use a variety of nationally normed assessments including the following: Bilingual Verbal Ability Tests (BVAT), IDEA Language Proficiency tests (IPT), Language Assessment Scales (LAS), and Woodcock-Munoz Language Survey (WMLS). This is not an exhaustive list. Guidance will be issued at the beginning of school year 2002-03 to inform LEAs that LEP students must be tested in all five domains of comprehension, reading, writing, speaking and listening. The guidance will also recommend a specific assessment, such as Woodcock-Munoz Language Survey, for LEAs that do not currently have an assessment program for English language proficiency.

Any English language proficiency assessment that is adopted, adapted or developed through the section 6112 grant will be aligned with the state's academic standards and will become part of the state's Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP). It is the intent of the MDE to develop or adopt an assessment that will measure English language proficiency and will be aligned with the state's English language arts standards and benchmarks so that the assessment can serve as a bridge between the English language proficiency assessment and the regular MEAP language arts assessment.

- k. In the **June 2002 submission**, describe the status of the State's effort to establish standards and annual measurable achievement objectives under section 3122(a) of the ESEA that relate to the development and attainment of English proficiency by

limited English proficient children. These standards and objectives must relate to the development and attainment of English proficiency in speaking, listening, reading, writing, and comprehension, and be aligned with the State academic content and student academic achievement standards as required by section 1111(b)(1) of the ESEA. If they are not yet established, describe the State's plan and timeline for completing the development of these standards and achievement objectives.

MDE will convene an advisory group of stakeholders, including expertise representing students who are special education students and LEP students, to produce a draft of English language standards during the 2002-03 school year. The draft of English language standards will be submitted to the State Board of Education and to the US ED for review.

Additional information provided to the US ED:

English language proficiency standards and annual measurable achievement objectives have not yet been developed in Michigan. The State will convene an advisory group of stakeholders to produce a draft of English language proficiency standards, aligned with annual measurable achievement objectives that relate to the development and attainment of English proficiency in speaking, listening, reading, writing and comprehension. This work will be accomplished during the 2002-03 school year. The draft of standards and achievement objectives will be submitted to the State Board of Education for review and approval and will be submitted to the US ED for review and approval by May 2003.

2. In the **June 2002 submission**, describe the process for awarding competitive subgrants for the programs listed below. In a separate response for each of these programs, provide a description of the following items, including how the State will address the related statutory requirements:
 - a. timelines
 - b. selection criteria and how they promote improved academic achievement
 - c. priorities and how they promote improved academic achievement.(In lieu of this description, the State may submit its RFP for the program.)

The programs to be addressed are:

1) Even Start Family Literacy (Title I, Part B).

To locate the complete Even Start Family Literacy request for proposals, go to: http://www.michigan.gov/documents/REVISED_ES_Continuation_Application_4-02_1_29167_7.pdf

Additional information provided to the US ED:

SUBGRANTING PROCESS

Timeline:

The Michigan Even Start subgranting process is moving from a fiscal year that has been October 1 through September 30 to one that is July 1 through June 30. This transition will require a period in which the dates of fiscal obligation will be October 1 through June 30. For FY03, when this transition is occurring, the competing grants were due May 31, with the initial review panel meeting on June 20 and final review panel on July 16. It is anticipated that the notification of awards will occur in mid-August. For any FY03 carryover and for FY04 funds, (anticipating the same cycle from this point forward), the notification of grants available will be posted in December/January, technical assistance sessions for the competition will occur in January, applications will be due in early March, reviews will occur in March/April, and successful applicants will be notified in May/June.

Likewise, the continuation awards are in transition. For FY03, requirements were split. Grantees were asked to submit data on the state outcome indicators by June 21, 2002, and integrate that data into their continuation application due July 10. The shortened next cycle will require the State to review interim data and collect continuation requests in April/May, with notification of funding or status change in May/June.

MDE assures that notice of the application will be widely distributed so that all eligible applicants will have opportunities to apply. The application will be posted on the Department's website approximately six to 12 weeks prior to its due date. An invitation to a technical assistance meeting in which the application will be discussed will also be posted. The application will be due approximately four to eight weeks after the technical assistance session. During that time, the Unit will recruit and confirm reviewers, with the legislatively mandated four reviewers per panel. Each team will review five to eight applications. Upon receipt, applications will be screened by Unit staff to ensure compliance with federal assurances and that the applicant has the legislatively-mandated partnership between an LEA and a public or private nonprofit organization. Within one week of the application deadline, reviewers will receive a packet including applications to review and review scoring materials, a blank application and supporting materials from the technical assistance meeting, non-conflict of interest forms, and travel instructions. The reviewers will convene in Lansing for a day-long review session. An exercise will be completed to assure inter-rater reliability among the panels, and then the panels will score the applications. Upon completion of the first review session, Unit staff will determine a selection of applications to be forwarded to a final panel. Again the make up of the panel will meet the legislative requirements. The final panel will review six to 12 grants, depending on the availability of funds. Upon completion of the final panel, the Unit will forward a recommendation for funding to the Superintendent of Public Instruction. Authority for approving final awards rests with the Superintendent.

Copies of the current instructions for both the competing and continuation grants were being forwarded separately. The following refers to specific questions posed by the US ED staff and refers to the instructions, for competing grants:

| Item | Grant Instructions | Page number |
|----------------------------|--------------------|----------------------------|
| Documentation of qualified | Competing | Page 22, rubric rows 3 and |

| | | |
|---|-----------|---|
| personnel to administer an Even Start Program | | 4 |
| Objectives, strategies, and relation to indicators | Competing | Page 22, rubric rows 1 and 2 |
| Activities and services | Competing | Page 22, rubric row 2 |
| Population and number to be served | Competing | Page 20, rubric row 2 |
| Collaborative efforts | Competing | Pages 18 and 19 |
| Ensuring most in need receive services and longevity in program | Competing | Page 21, rubric row 2 |
| Integration with other programs | Competing | Page 22, rubric row 2, refers back to program element 9 on page 9 if not already addressed in collaborative efforts discussion and agreements |
| Evaluation of progress | Competing | Page 22 rubric row 4 and page 23, rubric rows 1 and 2 under part 4 |

Committee of Practitioners

The Committee of Practitioners is used to address policy changes at the state level. The issuance of the request for grant proposals, as well as implementation of any legislative changes, are not considered issues of policy, but rather administrative decisions. If MDE proposes any criteria for the grant application that are beyond the legislative requirements, these will be shared with the Committee of Practitioners before being submitted to the State Board of Education for approval.

SELECTION CRITERIA

The State assures that the federal requirement that funds are awarded to areas that are most in need of Even Start services using the examples provided in the legislation will be met. Applications will be rated using a rubrics format, with points being assigned in several categories. The need for the program in the targeted area, including a careful analysis of the current services available to families is included in the request.

Collaboration with community agencies and partners, even if they are not joint applicants, will be another important factor. A full plan of implementation, with discussion of relevant research supporting the philosophy, model and practices will be required as part of the application. Applicants will be required to identify the persons (or qualifications if persons are not currently hired) proposed to lead and work in the Even Start program. Higher scores will be awarded to those applicants that assure that the instructional personnel will have the legislatively required qualifications. Applications will be rated on the quality of the staff proposed to manage and work in the programs, as well as on the ability of the administrative personnel to implement a strong staff development plan. Plans for assuring success and providing for a local evaluation are required to be addressed. Finally, applications that propose reasonable funding levels,

identifying sufficient local contributions to provide quality programming, will score most highly. The Unit will assure that the most highly ranked applications are funded, but will also assure that priority in awarding grants will be given to proposals that are designed to provide services in areas most in need, those that demonstrate the greatest degree of cooperation and coordination between a variety of relevant service providers, and those that have the greatest promise of serving as a model. Duplication of service will be avoided and assurance is given that there will be geographic diversity (balance of urban and rural) in the distribution of funds.

The specific items that are described in the review plan are addressed in the following areas of the instructions for competing applications.

| Item | Grant Instructions | Page number |
|---|--------------------|--|
| Most likely to be successful | Competing | Overall score and page 23, priority points |
| High percent/large number of children in need | Competing | Page 17, section on need with priority points |
| Services for at least 3-year age range | Competing | Page 20, rubric row 2 |
| Cooperation among service providers | Competing | Pages 18 and 19, particularly page 19, rubric row 1 |
| Cost effective | Competing | Page 15, rubric row 1 under Budget Detail, combined with information from Budget Narrative, scored in separate rubric, page 16 |
| Ability to provide non-federal share | Competing | Page 15, Budget Summary rubric |
| Represents urban/rural | Competing | Page 7 of instructions, under “additional review factors”, items 3 and 5 |
| Promise as a model | Competing | Page 23, rubric row 3 |

State priorities

This is the information that was forwarded to the Consolidated Application writing team in April 2002:

The State assures that the federal requirement that funds are awarded to areas that are most in need of Even Start services using the examples provided in the legislation will be met. Applications will be rated using a rubrics format, with points being assigned in several categories. The need for the program in the targeted area, including a careful analysis of the current services available to families is included in the request. Collaboration with community agencies and partners, even if they are not joint applicants, will be another important factor. A full plan of implementation, with discussion of relevant research supporting the philosophy, model, and practices will be

required as part of the application. Applicants will be required to identify the persons (or qualifications if persons are not currently hired) proposed to lead and work in the Even Start program, scoring highly those applicants that assure that the instructional personnel will have the legislatively required qualifications. Applications will be rated on the quality of the staff proposed to manage and work in the programs, as well as on the ability of the administrative personnel to implement a strong staff development plan. Plans for assuring success and providing for a local evaluation are required to be addressed. Finally, applications that propose reasonable funding levels, identifying sufficient local contributions to provide quality programming, will score most highly. The Unit will assure that the most highly ranked applications are funded, but will also assure that priority in awarding grants will be given to proposals that are designed to provide services in areas most in need, those that demonstrate the greatest degree of cooperation and coordination between a variety of relevant service providers, and have the greatest promise of serving as a model. Duplication of service will be avoided and assurance is given that there is geographic diversity (balance of urban and rural) in the distribution of funds.

| Item | Grant Instructions | Page number |
|---|--------------------|--------------------------|
| Priority for applicants describing services in high need areas or empowerment zones | Competing | Page 17, priority points |

State Allocation

The State's Even Start allocation is: \$8,704,774 (per Grant Award Notification dated 8/31/2001, PR/Award Number S213C010023A).

| | |
|--|-----------|
| Total amount reserved per subsection 1233(a) | \$522,286 |
| Amount reserved for administration: | \$261,143 |
| Amount reserved for technical assistance: | \$261,143 |

Identify the amount of the reservation under subsection 1233(a) that the State will use for each category of State-level activities listed in that section, and describe how the SEA will carry out those activities.

The State will reserve three percent of its Even Start grant for the following activities:

- Administration, including state level staff, activities related to the notification of fund availability, competition to determine dissemination of funds, dissemination activities, monitoring and evaluation of local projects, etc.
- Professional development and conferencing activities that support the development of Even Start local projects.

The State will reserve an additional three percent of its Even Start grant for the following activities:

- Subgrants or contracts to known providers for technical assistance designed to help local projects improve the quality of Even Start services or to further revise, improve, and implement the State's indicators of program quality.
- Subgrants or contracts to known providers for technical assistance designed to help local projects raise additional funds to support the activities funded through Even Start.

2) Education of Migrant Children (Title I, Part C).

Title I, Part C is a formula grant in Michigan. Funds are to be allocated based on the following criteria outlined in the funding formula approved by the State Board on March 31, 1999:

- First, funds are set aside for administration (1%), special statewide projects, and emergency situations.
- Then 50% of the remaining allocation is distributed to regular school year migrant programs and 50% to summer migrant programs.
- Regular school year funds are distributed to LEAs based upon the number of eligible students served during the previous school year. 2000-01 funds were allocated based on 1998-99 Migrant Education Database System (MEDS) enrollment data.
- 70% of the funds are distributed to LEAs based on enrollment. The remaining 30% is distributed based on the number of students in each category of three last qualifying moves (LQM)

| <u>LQM Category</u> | <u>Multiplying Factor Used for School Years 1999 - 2002</u> |
|----------------------------|--|
| 0-12 Months | 1.35 |
| 13-24 Months | 1.10 |
| 25-36 Months | 1.00 |

3) Prevention and Intervention for Children Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk -- Local Agency Programs (Title I, Part D, Subpart 2).

Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 is a formula grant in Michigan. Funds are allocated to school districts that serve institutions with a combined total of at least 50 residents for the preceding count year (November 1- October 30).

4) Comprehensive School Reform (Title I, Part F).

To locate the complete Comprehensive School Reform request for proposal go to:
http://www.michigan.gov/mde/1,1607,7-140-6525_6530_6559-21417--,00.html

5) Teacher and Principal Training and Recruiting Fund -- Subgrants to Eligible Partnerships (Title II, Part A, Subpart 3).

a. Timeline:

| | |
|-------------|--|
| August 2002 | Selection criteria will be identified and a request for proposals developed. |
|-------------|--|

| | |
|----------------|---|
| August 2002 | Selection criteria will be submitted for approval by the State Board of Education (SBE). |
| September 2002 | Request for proposals will be distributed and proposals will be received from applicants. |
| November 2002 | Proposals will be peer-reviewed and recommendations for funding will be made to Superintendent of Public Instruction. |
| December 2002 | Funding awards will be announced. |

b. Selection Criteria:

Proposals must demonstrate a partnership between an institution of higher education's (IHE) College or Department of Education, a College or Department of Arts and Science, and a high need local education agency. A high need district is defined as one having a student population of 10,000 or more students or 20% of the students served are from families living below the poverty level AND having a high percentage of teachers who are either not highly qualified or who teach out-of field.

Proposals must address professional development in the core academic areas or provide high quality professional development that improves instructional practices and student academic achievement; prepare individuals to return to schools and provide instruction related to professional development; and may include more than one LEA or IHE for the purpose of improving teaching and learning in low performing schools.

Partnerships must demonstrate the capacity to manage the implementation of proposed activities and to budget for the successful completion of professional development activities.

c. Priorities:

Priority will be given to those proposals establishing partnerships between an institution of higher education's Colleges or Departments of Education or Arts and Science and with a high need local education agency with a high percentage of teachers who are either not highly qualified or who teach out-of-field. Professional development activities must address the needs identified by the LEA for improving teaching and learning.

Additional information provided to the US ED:

The Superintendent of Public Instruction will continue its policy of making every reasonable effort with the awarding of competitive grants to assure a statewide balance in the geographical distribution. The Request for Proposals will be posted and made available electronically to all interested and eligible collaborative consortia.

6) Enhancing Education Through Technology (Title II, Part D)

a. Timeline:

MDE will announce the competitive grant program for the Enhanced Education through technology funds in the Fall 2002, with districts having an application due date of November 2002. It is anticipated that awards will be made by December 2002.

b. Selection Criteria:

There will be two different competitions. The first one will target five high-needs local education agencies that geographically represent the state. These agencies will be requested to describe how they could improve academic achievement across all grade levels by utilizing wireless technology. The selected proposals will have to substantiate what both students and staff will be expected to learn and what types of behavior changes will occur that will enable the improvements to occur. The evaluation of the project will determine how wireless technology impacts the attainment of AYP goals. Approximately \$4,000,000 will be available in this category.

The second competition will target those agencies that do not receive a substantial amount of funding in the formula portion of this grant program. The cutoff point has not yet been determined because the Title I allocations have not been determined. When those figures become available, the MDE will examine the range of formula dollars and attempt to bring the lowest funded districts up to a certain level. If funds are available, the minimum per agency amount will be \$10,000. However, each agency applying for this part of the competition would be required to indicate how the additional funding would enable them to improve academic achievement and how they would adhere to all of the requirements (technology plan, etc.) outlined in the legislation.

Additional information provided to the US ED:

A competition will be held to identify five pilot districts from the list of eligible districts. The awards will be given only to districts meeting the requirements outlined in Section 2403.

c. Priorities:

In both categories of the competition, priorities will be given to those agencies with greater levels of students in poverty and with lower levels of student achievement. The agencies will also be required to describe how they will maximize these funds by combining them with other federal, state, local and private funding sources for the purposes described in their application.

7) Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities -- (Title IV, Part A, section 4112).

Governor's Portion

To locate the complete Safe and Drug-Free Communities request for proposals go to:
http://www.michigan.gov/documents/Jan18_Final_GDG_Application_1_29172_7.pdf

a. Procedures and Timeline:

The Office of Drug Control Policy has been designated by the Governor's Office as the agency responsible for administration of this grant program. Each year the Education Section (staffed by personnel with experience in administering this program for 10 years) prepares a grant announcement. The Executive Office, Office of Drug Control Policy (ODCP), and the Department of Education assure that notice of this funding opportunity will be widely distributed so that all eligible applicants (including faith-based organizations, schools, and other community-based organizations) will have an opportunity to apply. Application forms will be posted on the E-Michigan government website, and distributed at workshops held throughout Michigan.

FY2002-2003 Grants: The 2002 Governor's Discretionary Grant application is included as an attachment to Michigan's State Consolidated Application. ODCP has received applications and is in the process of reviewing and approving grants with an effective date of October 1, 2002 (state fiscal year).

FY 2003-2004 Grants: The 2003 Governor's Discretionary Grant application grant application will be prepared in accordance with established state and federal procedures by February 1, 2003. Solicitation for proposals will begin after this date and grants will be awarded with an effective date of October 1, 2003, or earlier.

b. Selection Criteria:

Michigan uses a competitive grant process to award a majority of subgrants. Selection criteria include: (1) whether the applicant uses effective research-based prevention programs and strategies that are effective in changing attitudes and behaviors of youth; (2) whether the selected program is appropriate based on the needs assessment; (3) whether the applicant developed the program in coordination and collaboration with schools and parents; (4) the effectiveness of the application in meeting the review criteria and the federal *Principles of Effectiveness*; and (5) that the application has been reviewed by a state-level peer review panel.

Programs and activities funded cannot duplicate the efforts of the state education agency or local school districts regarding school-based drug and violence prevention activities. Special consideration shall be given to applicants pursuing a comprehensive approach to prevention. This includes the incorporation of mental health services relating to drug and violence prevention services and a strong parent participation component to reinforce what youth are learning.

c. Priorities:

Priority will be given to applicants serving: (1) individuals who are not normally served by state and local educational agencies; and (2) populations that need special services or additional resources (such as youth in juvenile detention facilities, runaway or homeless children and youth, pregnant and parenting teenagers, and school dropouts). Others areas may be determined at a later date.

d. Academic Achievement:

It is widely agreed that school and community discipline problems have a negative impact on academic achievement. Therefore funded projects must promote academic achievement, and one way of guaranteeing that achievement is to begin with a safe environment conducive to learning.

8) Community Service Grants (Title IV, Part A, section 4126).

The Community Service Grant program is new. MDE will apply for these funds and submit the specific information requested by September 1, 2002.

9) 21st Century Community Learning Centers (CCLC) (Title IV, Part B).

a. Timeline:

The SBE approved criteria for the 21st Century Community Learning Centers grant program in May 2002. The application will be posted on the website in late July, with technical assistance offered in mid-August. A due date of late September is anticipated. Grants will be awarded by December 1, 2002, with services expected to begin no later than the first day of the second semester (late January- early February).

b. Selection Criteria:

Selection criteria include the federal requirements for eligible applicants that will serve low income students (30% free and reduced lunch), with extra priority given to serving those in low-achieving schools. Beyond priority to high-need and very high-need populations that have the most to gain from the programs, the application in rubric format will take into account the match between the services offered and the needs of the community in order to promote academic achievement. Programs selected for funding must show a connection between the activities of the proposed 21st CCLC program and the curriculum and goals of the school(s) the students attend, including plans to work directly with the teachers of enrolled students. Programs selected will offer a diversity of additional services that serve the needs of students and their families and provide opportunities for parent involvement. Programs selected will show the potential for high quality and results based on the proposed staff qualifications and program plans. Applicants will be asked to explain why they are choosing certain activities to meet the needs they have identified.

MDE will not accept applications from schools or agencies unless they propose to serve school attendance areas that have at least 30% of the students eligible for free or reduced price meals (families at 185% of the federal poverty level or less). If applications come in to serve areas above this threshold, they will be notified that they are ineligible. As the applications come in, eligibility will be verified. If private schools apply, they will need to prove that their clientele fits the eligibility by collecting this or similar information. If any school attendance area or community proposed to be served has 40% or more poverty, it will get priority points. Then entire application will be scored on a point system, e.g., 10 points for project abstract, 40 points for budget, 100 points for narrative proposal, plus priority points for special populations. It will be a significant advantage for 40% poverty, for serving buildings in school improvement status, and partnering with a community agency. The application will be posted at the end of July.) The 40% poverty is appropriate as a priority because it is much more stringent; not only is the percentage greater, but it's 100% of poverty rather than 185% of poverty as for just being eligible to apply.

c. Priorities:

Priority points will be given for very high-need populations, including programs that propose to serve very low income school attendance areas (40% or more poverty; eligible for Title I schoolwide programs), middle school students, homeless students, students with limited English speaking ability, and students with disabilities. Priority will be given to programs that indicate collaborative efforts between schools and community organizations, with highest priority being given to LEAs that apply jointly with community based organizations (CBO) and propose services to Title I buildings in School Improvement status. Priority points will also be awarded to applicants proposing services to students who attend low-performing schools, those identified through EducationYES! (the Michigan accountability system) as d-alert or unaccredited (or a similar marker until the status is released). The priorities serve to make sure the neediest areas are selected in which students have the most to gain from high quality out of school time programs. The priorities related to collaboration improve the likelihood that providers other than school districts will share their expertise and concern and promote sustainability after the grant period.

Additional information provided to the US ED:

While applicants are completing applications, from late July 2002, until late September, Early Childhood and Parenting Programs staff will recruit and confirm reviewers, with a target of four reviewers per panel to review five to eight applications. Reviewers will come from public and private schools, private agencies and associations, state government, and universities. Reviewers from agencies or schools that are applying for the grant will not be allowed. Within one week of the application deadline, reviewers will receive a packet including applications to review and review scoring materials, a blank application and supporting materials from the technical assistance meetings, non-conflict of interest forms, and travel instructions. The application will be written in a rubric format, and the same rubrics will be transferred to the review scoring materials so

that the grant writers and reviewers will be working from a common understanding of the scoring criteria. There will be rubrics for the scoring of each element of the application. The reviewers will convene for a day-long review session. All of the panels will receive one of the applications, and an exercise will be completed using it to assure inter-rater reliability among the panels. The panels will then score each of the applications according to the rubrics. Unit staff will monitor the review session carefully to assure that the panels keep to the same "metric" as determined during the inter-rater reliability exercise, that all priority points are awarded correctly, and that the arithmetic is correct. Upon completion of the review session, Unit staff will prepare a recommendation for funding to the Superintendent of Public Instruction. The Unit will assure that the most highly ranked applications are funded, but will also assure that duplication of service is avoided and that there is geographic diversity in the distribution of funds. This is the process that will be used for 2002-2003. This is one of the grant programs that may be targeted for the electronic system for next year (2003-2004). The principles will remain the same, but the grants may be submitted electronically instead of in paper format.

3. In the **June 2002 submission**, describe how the State will monitor and provide professional development and technical assistance to LEAs, schools, and other subgrantees to help them implement their programs and meet the State's (and those entities' own) performance goals and objectives. This description should include the assistance the State Education Agency (SEA) will provide to LEAs, schools, and other subgrantees in identifying and implementing effective instructional programs and practices based on scientific research.

The following describes a sampling of the types of technical assistance that will be offered by various program offices.

The MDE's Office of Field Services (OFS) was established in 1998 to assist LEAs and schools in coordinating their resources under the following subgrants to implement effective programs focused on improvement of student achievement: Title I, Parts A, C, and D; Title II, Eisenhower; Title VI, Innovative Programs; Title VII, Bilingual; Emergency Immigrant, Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration; Class Size Reduction; and Refugee Children School Impact Grant. In addition, the Office coordinates the following State funded grants: Section 31a, At Risk; Section 32e, Small Class Size; and Section 41, Bilingual Education. OFS provides oversight for these programs through an integrated monitoring process (On Site Review) that includes follow-up technical assistance to improve program practices and correct any instances of noncompliance. OFS consultants also collaborate with other MDE staff, intermediate school district consultants, and other external technical assistance providers to fund intensive assistance to the state's lowest achieving schools. A description of OFS can be found at the following website:

http://www.michigan.gov/documents/OFS_Operationalizing_29155_7.pdf

21st Century Community Learning Grants (CCLC)

The Early Childhood and Parenting Programs Unit will begin its 21st CCLC technical assistance even before the awarding of grants by providing three regional conferences (also available by videoconference or later by videocassette) highlighting successful

practices and ideas from exemplary programs. Evaluations and evidence of academic success related to the programs will be shared. Evaluations based on scientific methods will be emphasized. The National Center for Community Education will partner in providing these conferences. Successful grantees will be expected to attend one or two national professional development activities sponsored by the Mott Foundation through the National Center for Community Education and to budget funds for regional conferences as well. The State will collaborate with grantees and the Michigan Association for Community and Adult Education in developing one statewide conference each year for the funded programs. All staff in the funded programs should be able to attend this statewide conference. In addition, the State will sponsor technical assistance meetings as needed, particularly regarding the evaluation requirements in conjunction with the contractor chosen to implement the statewide evaluation. It is anticipated that meetings will be needed to discuss data collection content and methodology, and that grantees will need additional assistance in developing local evaluations that are meaningful. Assistance with collaboration issues is also anticipated. There may be additional needs for assistance on specific topics as the projects develop. The topics for technical assistance will be shaped through the evaluation, and also through the Department's on-site monitoring of funded programs. The Department plans to split one position between two staff consultants, each with a master's degree in education and experience with out-of-school time programs, to administer and take the lead on the 21st CCLC program. An additional four consultants who lead other Unit initiatives will spend 10% of their time each on the 21st CCLC. All six consultants are assigned to geographic areas within the state and will be able to monitor multiple programs on their site visits, i.e., visit a preschool program in the morning and an after school program in the afternoon. In this way, resources and travel expenses can be used wisely, but more importantly, relationships with school districts and community agencies can be more comprehensive. It is anticipated that many successful applicants will be Community Education departments of school districts and community agencies that also participate in early childhood initiatives. The relationships and issues of collaboration and academic and developmental performance goals and objectives will be handled in a more thorough manner through this plan. The program unit has developed and is forwarding for State Board of Education approval *Standards of Quality for Out-of-School Time Programs*. The indicators in the standards can be used as a tool for program monitoring. The program staff will develop a protocol for on-site visits including records review, interviews with staff, students, parents, and community members, review of evaluation, and activity program monitoring. In addition to the standards, other available tools from national organizations may be considered for monitoring programs at various age groups and by type of program. Tools will be chosen based on the evidence that they can measure differences between programs that are successful in raising student achievement and related outcomes from those that are not successful in improving students' academic and other skills. Each grantee will be monitored at least twice during its five year grant period. Additional monitoring and on-site assistance may be required if a program is having difficulty in a particular area. Programs that are not able to improve student achievement after additional assistance will not continue to be funded for additional years.

Even Start Family Literacy Program

The Early Childhood and Parenting Programs Unit will utilize a variety of modes to provide technical assistance to programs. A protocol for on-site visits including records review, interviews with staff, parents, and community members and program monitoring has been developed. Follow-up reports from the on-site visit provide specific feedback and recommendations to the local program, but also provide topics for technical assistance. Other topics are shaped through evaluation. Unit staff provide an on-site visit at least twice in the first year. The Unit currently plans to monitor each grantee at least twice during its four year grant period. Additional monitoring and on-site assistance will be required if a program fails to make sufficient progress in reaching the State outcomes. Depending on the issue, this technical assistance may be provided by State staff or by providers of known quality. The Even Start Statewide Family Literacy Initiative that received funding for 2000 and 2001 and is finishing activities on a no-cost extension in 2002 was able to put into place key elements of a technical assistance and professional development system as well as a statewide evaluation system that will provide guidance in the most prevalent areas that need to be strengthened, particularly focusing on a program's success in raising student achievement and related outcomes from those that are not successful in improving students' academic and other skills. Training modules are being developed that will be implemented at regional training, mentoring and support centers. The training modules will include information on scientifically based reading research to the extent that it is available for the topics necessary to implement strong family literacy services. A website with a bulletin board function is under construction. The State provides for an annual conferencing activity, which may be implemented collaboratively with other state level agencies, such as the Department of Career Development, the department that administers the funds from the Adult Education and Family Literacy Act.

The Office of Special Education and Early Intervention Services is building an action research database at seven pilot school sites. The purpose is to implement the Quality Assurance Review (QAR) process to increase effective professional development planning that results in improved student performance (including students with disabilities). The professional development needs at each site are measured based upon the results of a comprehensive needs assessment survey using ten indicators of systemic best practice based on research. For three years, the surveys are being field tested as pre- and post-tests that are completed by staff at the classroom, school, and central office level in the LEA. Technical assistance is provided at the school site and through quarterly meetings throughout the school year to teach, apply, and evaluate the QAR process and related best practices to improve student performance. The challenge of the research is to connect the professional development to successful strategies described in the Action Plan to data results that indicate improved student performance. It is anticipated that, after the three-year period of action research, a statewide needs assessment survey will be available through the Internet for all schools and school districts to access and use both the aggregate and discrete data as a basis for future professional development planning AND measure their respective continuous improvement based upon improved student performance data results.

Other program areas not included above will provide monitoring and technical assistance throughout the grant cycles. Department staff will continue to work together to coordinate activities such as providing LEAs with ways to implement effective instructional programs based on scientific research. The Office of Professional Preparation Services will continue to convene forums of teacher preparation faculty to provide technical assistance on research-based instructional programs and practices that should be incorporated into teacher preparation programs. All units administering grant programs are expected to provide LEAs guidance needed for operating successful programs that meet the State's performance goals and objectives as well as those described in the individual district's high-quality school improvement plan.

4. In the **June 2002 submission**, describe the Statewide system of support under section 1117 for ensuring that all schools meet the State's academic content and student achievement standards, including how the State will provide assistance to low-performing schools.

Meeting Academic Content and Student Achievement Standards

Michigan uses strategies including partnership and outreach to ensure that all schools meet the State's academic content and student achievement standards. Michigan's system of 57 intermediate school districts (ISDs) are the major providers of curriculum consultation and professional development. Outreach through the ISDs provides explanation of and professional development around the Michigan Model Content Standards. Additionally, partnerships with higher education institutions (IHEs) teacher preparation programs and statewide associations and organizations will provide direct communication with classroom teachers across the state.

Assisting Low-Performing Schools Approach

MDE plans to use a three-pronged approach to provide assistance to low-performing schools. (1) The approach will start with an information management and assessment system to keep track of student learning. (2) Direct support will be provided at the school building site to support the system. (3) High quality professional development will get the tools to the teachers in the school to upgrade their skills in teaching reading, then in mathematics. Identified schools will need sustained assistance over a two to three year period.

Information Management and Assessment System

Low-performing schools need systems to track student achievement throughout the year and as students move from grade to grade. Funding is needed to support a functional information management and assessment system in identified schools. Schools will choose a commercial, off-the-shelf system that has been identified with respect to alignment with state standards, system robustness, and teacher friendliness. Additionally, this system will be compliant with standards developed by CEPI in consultation with student information systems' vendors and LEA representatives to facilitate the exchange of appropriate student data between LEA systems and the SRSD.

Direct Support

During 2001-02, MDE piloted the Partnership for Success program in several low-performing schools. This pilot is showing that focus and support are both needed to improve achievement in these schools. The Department plans to follow this pilot by selecting top-notch professionals (master teachers and principals) from their districts to provide focused assistance to low-performing schools for a two to three year period. These partners will be assigned to a group of low-performing schools to coach the building staff in the use of the assessment tools and the implementation of proven practices in the classrooms. Each partner will be assigned to no more than four identified schools. The partner's work will be frequent, spending at least one day each week in the school.

High Quality Professional Development

Teachers in low-performing schools need high quality professional development to improve their skills in teaching reading/English language arts and mathematics. The professional development must be intense and sustained with adequate follow-up in the classroom to refine and reinforce research-based techniques. The Department is piloting this effort in the TARGET/PLUS project in 2001-02 and in projects currently supported by the Title II, Eisenhower higher education professional development programs. Additional plans will be developed in the summer and fall 2002 by the various stakeholder partners, including the Departments of Treasury and Career Development, the Michigan Virtual University (MVU), ISDs, Mathematics and Science Centers, higher education including community colleges, and the other existing professional development provider networks.

5. In the **June 2002 submission**, describe the activities the State will conduct to --
 - a. Help Title I schools make effective use of schoolwide programs to improve the achievement of all students, including specific steps the SEA is taking and will take to modify or eliminate State fiscal and accounting barriers so that schools can easily consolidate federal, State, and local funds for schoolwide programs;

Eligible Title I schools are encouraged to plan and implement schoolwide programs that are integrated with their state-required school improvement plans. A statewide Ed Flex waiver permits any Title I school with a poverty concentration of at least 35% to operate as a schoolwide program. Schools that wish to do this are given a one-year planning grant to work with a knowledgeable and experienced technical assistance provider to develop a comprehensive schoolwide plan. The effectiveness of existing schoolwide programs is monitored through the On Site Review process and the statewide accountability system. Schools that are not meeting accountability standards for the achievement of all students may apply for intensive comprehensive school reform assistance through the federal Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration (CSRD) grant program and Title I grants for low-performing schools. The lowest achieving schools also receive intensive state-funded improvement assistance from Partner

Educators and other providers.

- b. Ensure that all teachers, particularly those in high-poverty areas and those in schools in need of improvement, are highly qualified. This description should include the help the States will provide to LEAs and schools to –
 - i. Conduct effective professional development activities;

The State has a variety of structures in place to ensure that teachers are highly qualified. The following summary provides a brief overview of several examples within these structures.

- Policies and requirements that support LEAs providing effective professional Development include:
 - Section 1526, State School Code (Mentoring and Induction)
 - Section 1527, State School Code (require five days of professional development for all teachers annually)
 - Section 101(11) State School Code (Provision to provide time for work-embedded professional development)
 - Education YES! (Professional development as one of 11 quality indicators)
 - School Improvement Plans (Require a local professional development plan)

INITIATIVES CURRENTLY SUPPORTED BY THE STATE THAT ASSIST LEAS IN CONDUCTING EFFECTIVE PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES INCLUDE THOSE LISTED BELOW. ADDITIONAL EFFORTS WILL BE PLANNED BY THE VARIOUS STAKEHOLDERS TO ASSURE HIGH-QUALITY RESEARCH-BASED ACTIVITIES ALIGNED TO THE STANDARDS.

- Partnership for Success – technical assistance at the building level
 - MI-CLiMB end-user training
 - Building a Presence for Science
 - Marco Polo Website Training
 - Special Education Quality Assurance Review (QAR)
 - Gates LEAD Michigan
- Networks currently operating in Michigan that assist LEAs to conduct effective professional development activities include those listed below
 - MDE, All Offices that provide or affect professional development (PD)
 - MLPP Michigan Literacy Performance Profile Centers
 - Mathematics-Science Centers
 - M-TIP Sustained Learning Regions
 - Center for Ed. Networking access to PD (students with disabilities)
 - State Improvement Grant under the Individuals with Disabilities Educational Act
 - MI-Access Coordinator/Administration Manual

- MI-Access PREVIEW videotape
- MI-Access Training videotape and accompanying materials
- Positive Behavior Support
- On-line autism teacher training

SAMPLE OF CURRENT PROFESSIONAL LEARNING TOOLS PROVIDED OR SUPPORTED BY STATE:

- MLPP Michigan Literacy Progress Profile
 - MI-CLiMB
 - MI-Access CD ROM Alternate Assessment
- Projected professional learning tools, policies, initiatives supported by MDE:
 - TARGET/PLUS project (begins in Fall 2002)
 - Mentor and Induction Standards (Fall 2002)
 - Web-based professional development recording/reflection tool (Winter 2002-03)
 - Baseline data for teachers and paraprofessionals collected by CEPI through the Registry of Educational Personal (REP) and reported (September 2002)
 - Updated Vision and Standards for Professional Development (Fall 2002)
 - State wide, searchable professional development database (Fall 2002)
 - REP Professional Development Data from all LEAs (June 2003)
 - Regional professional learning sessions on State's Updated PD Vision and Standards (Beginning in October, 2002)

In addition to the on-going efforts listed above, MDE will:

- Convene state-level professional organizations that provide professional development for the purpose of developing a vision of quality and seek commitment to align activities with high standards of PD by September, 2002;
 - Develop strategies to support LEAs, especially high poverty schools, to increase the qualifications of their paraprofessionals; and
 - Collaborate with IHEs, ISDs, and other similar organizations to provide regional in-service programs to inform teachers and administrators of critical timelines for compliance with NCLB requirements for highly qualified teachers, certification requirements, and procedures for becoming fully certificated/highly qualified. MDE will convene a forum to allow teacher preparation institutions to share information and demonstrate the features of alternative route teacher preparation programs offered for teacher certification. MDE will identify and make accessible modules and other resources to aid the achievement of instructional goals for student learning by December 2002.
- ii. Recruit and hire highly qualified teachers, including those licensed or certified through alternative routes; and

Data collected by CEPI for the REP for schools in high poverty areas and those identified as in need of improvement will be audited by MDE against the License 2000 database in December 2002 to identify teachers who do not have the appropriate level certificate and

endorsement for their teaching assignment or are employed in an approved area of teacher shortage under section 1233b of the Michigan School Code. This provision requires at least a bachelors or higher degree.

MDE will assist and approve the development and implementation of alternative route teacher preparation programs to increase the pool of teacher candidates and accelerate the completion of certification requirements to become highly qualified. In September 2002, MDE will electronically post and advertise areas of teacher shortage and will provide links to job placement services. CEPI through the REP will provide teacher shortage data.

iii. Retain highly qualified teachers.

MDE will do the following to retain qualified teachers:

- Develop and adopt standards for mentoring and induction of new teachers by December 2002.
 - Identify and make available professional development resources that target the needs of new teachers. The REP managed by CEPI, will provide data on professional development resources accessed by teachers by June 2003.
 - Require the inclusion of teacher mentors and new teacher induction in school improvement plans by June 2003.
 - Utilize on-line professional development.
 - Audit annual professional development plans for new teachers for compliance with section 1526 of the School Code, which requires 15 days of professional development during the first three years of classroom teaching.
- c. Ensure that all paraprofessionals (excluding those working with parents or as translators) attain the qualifications stated in sections 1119(c) and (d) by the 2005-2006 school year.

MDE will work with state organizations and IHEs to develop high quality professional development programs that are accessible to paraprofessionals across the state. MDE will also work with stakeholder groups to identify assessments that are appropriate for paraprofessionals to demonstrate that they have a high level of knowledge and skill in reading, writing, and mathematics. MDE will also include the review of paraprofessional qualifications in the LEA single audit criteria. The REP data will be used to identify the qualifications of paraprofessionals.

- d. Help LEAs with a high need for technology, high percentages or numbers of children in poverty, and low-performing schools to form partnerships with other LEAs, institutions of higher education, libraries, and other private and public for-profit and non-profit entities with technology expertise to improve the use of technology in instruction.

MDE staff will meet with Regional Educational Media Center (REMC)/ISD and MVU contacts to develop strategies the ISDs can implement for the purposes of (1) assisting

LEAs in forming partnerships; and (2) facilitating partnerships by bringing appropriate entities together.

June - August 2002 - MDE will conduct focus groups with REMC/ISD, MVU, and MDE representatives to obtain input on strategies and identification of entities with technology expertise.

August - September 2002 - MDE, in collaboration with representatives from REMC/ISDs and MVU, will develop key strategies and scenarios for implementation by ISDs.

Beginning October 2002 - ISDs will work with LEAs in forming partnerships and applying for competitive grants under Enhancing Education Through Technology and utilizing other grant funds to assist these LEAs in improving the use of technology in education.

- e. Promote parental and community participation in schools.

The Office of Field Services will review parental and community participation in the On Site Review process. The Office will develop a list of practices that are effective in various types of communities. These practices will be reinforced in all other grant programs.

Additional information provided to the US ED:

The State of Michigan has a state funding source for Bilingual Education. This state law contains extensive parent notification and information requirements which the Office of Field Services (OFS) monitors as part of its On Site Review process. In addition to this monitoring, OFS will disseminate parent "right to know" information from No Child Left Behind in workshops as part of the regular technical assistance plan. The On Site Review process will also include review of the parent "right to know" provisions from No Child Left Behind.

- f. Secure the baseline and follow-up data for the core ESEA accountability system described in Part I.

Michigan will use state assessment data (MEAP and MI-Access) collected and housed by CEPI's STAR data to set baselines for Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) as required by the federal statute. In addition, the state will collect and report the baseline data for its accountability system, Education Yes!, and provide this information to schools and LEAs. This information will be available by December 2002.

- 6. In the **June 2002 submission**, describe how...

As required under federal law, the Michigan Department of Education will continue to collaborate and coordinate the various ESEA funded programs and state level activities with organizations representing business, IHEs, nonprofit organizations and other state

agencies. The following are examples of the type of coordination and connections made with and across the programs related to a. through d in the following section.

- a. SEA officials and staff consulted with the Governor's office in the development of the State plan;

MDE has consulted the Governor's office in the review of the State consolidated application. The Governor's Education policy liaison, Ms. Kim Wells, participated in preliminary discussions on June 7, 2002, related to the development and implementation of an action plan to assure that the application's plans are completed according to time schedules and with the various stakeholders and publics needed to be involved. The State requires submission of federal grant applications to the State Budget Office. This application was submitted to and reviewed by Ms. Robbie Jameson, Director, Education and Infrastructure, State Budget Office, Department of Management and Budget. Staff from the Governor's Office and the State Budget Office will continue to be involved in the on-going development and implementation of Michigan's plan, to be submitted by April 2003.

- b. State officials and staff will coordinate the various ESEA-funded programs with state-level activities the State administers;
- MDE program directors meet weekly to discuss program issues and opportunities for collaboration and teamwork. These conversations will continue to lead to connections for ESEA and state-level programs.
- As an example of other collaborations, Michigan offers a number of state-funded early childhood initiatives, including the Michigan School Readiness Program (MSRP) for 26,000 four-year-olds at-risk of school failure, the All Students Achieve Program-Parent Involvement and Education Grants (ASAP-PIE), and the age 0-3 Secondary Prevention grants. Staff managing each of these initiatives belong to interagency advisory groups that include representatives from special education preschool programs and Head Start. The staff also represent their programs on committees such as the Head Start-State Collaboration Program Advisory Committee and the State Interagency Coordinating Council for Part C of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). State funded programs are required to supplement but not supplant federal programs. Local and countywide advisory committees also meet representing all of the funded programs. Activities such as collaborative recruitment and enrollment of children and staff development enhance all of the programs at the local level. At the state level, in addition to committee work and efforts such as "Ready to Succeed" (a collaborative public and private effort to enhance early childhood development in the state), a collaborative early childhood conference and a number of other professional development opportunities are held.
- c. State officials and staff will coordinate with other organizations, such as businesses, IHEs, nonprofit organizations; and

- Work is on-going with Michigan Business Leaders for Excellence in Education (MBLEE); the Education Alliance, an organization representing professional organizations such as the Michigan Education Association (MEA), the Michigan Federation of Teachers (MFT), Michigan Association of School Administrators (MASA), Michigan Association of Secondary School Principals (MASSP), and Michigan Elementary and Middle School Principals Association (MEMSPA); Michigan Safe Schools Initiative; Michigan PTA; over 30 content associations; and special population advocacy groups including groups mandated by state and federal laws. These groups provide input, writing, and review of policies, projects, and documents developed by MDE to guide and support schools to help all children learn. These groups have provided input for the Curriculum Framework, Michigan YES! accountability system, MI-CLiMB, and a host of other projects. MDE will continue to collaborate with IHEs to implement the alternative route to certification in urban areas, particularly in Pontiac and Detroit.
- A statewide partnership committee for the 21st CCLC initiative met in April and plans quarterly meetings for the first year of the program and twice a year thereafter. This committee is widely representative of schools, associations, parents, business, state agencies, and others concerned with student achievement and after school programs.
- d. State officials and staff will coordinate with other agencies, including the Governor's office, and with other Federal programs (including those authorized by Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, the Perkins Vocational and Technical Education Act, the Head Start Act, the Adult Education and Family Literacy Act, and the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act).
- Staff from the Governor's office will continue to be invited to all appropriate planning meetings.
- The Departments of Education, Career Development (DCD), Treasury (MDT) and CEPI deputies will continue to meet monthly to assure coordination and collaboration of on-going programs and services.
- MDE staff regularly work with the state-level Human Services Directors Interagency Group, which includes the Departments of Community Health (MDCH), Consumer and Industry Services (CIS), DCD, Family Independence Agency (FIA), and Education Office of Services to the Aging, to coordinate policy development and implementation of services between the state and local levels.
- MDE currently coordinates Putting It Together with Michigan Families (PIT Crew). The PIT Crew meets monthly to work on issues that cut across systems such as training, information systems, and barrier busters. It allows for broad participation of staff from across systems, as well as community members and

others, on various committees of the PIT Crew." For details, go to:
<http://www.mdch.state.mi.us/pit/pit.htm>

- MDE, Office of Professional Preparation, and the Department of Career Development convened representatives from state community colleges to expand pre-service teaching offerings for both elementary and secondary education. This supports the teacher cadet programs now operating in 13 sites around the state to recruit high school students to an education career operated through career education centers. Local universities worked with school personnel to develop a curriculum related to the fundamentals of teaching. Students in these programs will go to the local community college and then complete their preparation at a four-year institution. This effort addresses MDE's on-going effort to develop, recruit, and support the development of high quality teachers.
- MDE works collaboratively with the Interagency Migrant Services Committee (IMSC) comprised of a wide-ranging group of agencies that serve migrant needs, including: the Family Independence Agency, Department of Consumer and Industry Services, Department of Career Development, the Department of Community Health, Migrant Legal Assistance Project, Michigan State University Extension Service, Commission on Spanish Speaking Affairs, U.S. Department of Labor, Social Security Administration, Immigration and Naturalization Service, and others, on both intrastate and interstate efforts to assure high quality education opportunities for migrant students. MDE is also a member of the IMEC (Interstate Migrant Education Council) comprised of 27 states that serve migrant students. The focus of the Council is the migrant student. It deals with issues surrounding the education of the highly mobile migrant student. MDE has three representatives on this Council.
- The Director of the Office of Special Education and Early Intervention Services (OSE/EIS) as a member of the Education Services Director's group insures the integration of services for children with disabilities into the development of all general education efforts. These opportunities have led to the development of MI-Access, the state alternate assessment program for students with disabilities (as required by IDEA); have addressed the needs of students with disabilities in the Education YES! System; and have brought to general education the opportunity to benefit from the Positive Behavior Support program originally designed for parents and teachers of students with disabilities. In addition, special education staff are part of teams working on early childhood policy development, literacy, and early intervention for students at risk for reading failure; are working collaboratively with the Office of School Excellence, Curriculum Unit in the extension of the Michigan Model Content Standards and in the development of MI-Access alternate assessments; are involved with Title I to focus on improving student performance through the Quality Assurance Review (IDEA funded pilots in seven schools in the state.); and in the development of state assessment guidelines documents. The OSE/EIS director is appointed to the Governor's Reading First Leadership Team, which is charged with oversight in Making

Reading First in Michigan, assuring special education integration in the planning, implementation, and evaluation of Michigan's progress in literacy.

- The Department of Career Development (DCD) administers the Perkins Vocational and Technical Education Act and the Adult Education and Family Literacy Act. The deputies of these state agencies meet monthly with MDE's deputies to assure collaboration of efforts in areas such as Education YES!, the development of curriculum, and policies that impact all students. Curriculum specialists work together on a variety of projects to make connections. One example is a current effort funded by DCD to develop a CD-ROM tool for teachers to show the linkage of the six career pathways, the state's mathematics benchmarks, and the Secretary's Commission on Achieving Necessary Skills (SCANS) document for courses taught in the automotive fields. In development are links to standards for courses in construction, information technology, natural resources, and manufacturing. The tool provides an understanding for students and teachers of the content standards imbedded in the curriculum and also examples of how these standards are used in a real world context. These will be made available to mathematics and other academic teachers via a trainer-of-trainer session during Summer 2002, continuing with additional sessions statewide in the 2002-2003 school year. The state's accountability system, Education YES!, will require an Education Development Plan (EDP) for all high school students as a result of the on-going collaborative work.
- The State will contract with a research entity to develop a comprehensive evaluation of the 21st CCLC initiative focusing on improvements in student achievement.
- Even Start legislation requires local programs to coordinate with state and federal programs; thus, it is imperative that coordination also take place at the state level. The Even Start Statewide Family Literacy Initiative Consortium provides regular meetings to discuss how other state and federal programs can interface with Even Start to assure non-duplication, coordination, and integration of the opportunities allowed through each of the programs supported by the various funding streams. The Even Start Early Childhood Program unit will maintain this valuable activity after the end of the statewide grant.
- The McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act staff regularly coordinate their activities with the Michigan Coalition Against Homeless and the Michigan Homeless Assistance Advisory Committee, coordinated by the Michigan State Housing Development Authority (MSHDA). The new requirements for this act have been discussed and distributed to representatives of local districts this spring by the field consultants from the MDE Office of Field Services. This type of collaboration to assist in disseminating information reflects the cross-programmatic cooperation. The office administering the McKinney-Vento Act will develop a complete plan in the next six months to specifically describe how LEAs will become informed about the requirement and role of the staff liaison for

students in homeless situations. It will describe the federal programs and other agencies that will be involved in developing and disseminating this information.

In summary, there are a variety of mechanisms to assure that coordination around state and federal programs occurs with various organizations. This happens through regularly scheduled meetings of interagency groups, via regular internal meetings with MDE managers, on an as-needed basis related to particular issues and tasks, and when new efforts are being planned, revised, and evaluated. Stakeholders and customers provide input or become part of a development team.

7. In the **June 2002 submission**, describe the strategies the State will use to determine, on a regular basis, whether LEAs, schools, and other subgrantees are making satisfactory progress in meeting State and local goals and desired program outcomes. In doing so, the SEA should also describe how it will use data it gathers from subgrantees on how well they are meeting State performance targets, and the actions the State will take to determine or revise interventions for any LEAs, schools, and other subgrantees that are not making substantial progress.

By May 1, 2003, MDE will develop a Department-wide process for determining whether or not all subgrantees are making satisfactory progress in meeting state and local goals. The CEPI student and performance data warehouse will be used to report and manage the data. Contractor data for the 21st Century Community Learning Grants will also be coordinated with CEPI. When it is determined that a subgrantee is not making satisfactory progress, MDE will implement a multi-step plan that will be developed during the next few months.

PART III: ESEA KEY PROGRAMMATIC REQUIREMENTS AND FISCAL INFORMATION

In the **June 2002 submission**, for items 1-14 and the two final questions on uses of funds, please provide a brief narrative response. Where applicable, the State may include Website references, electronic files, or other existing documentation to comply with the requirements listed in the application. (All electronic references and hyperlinks should point explicitly to applicable content.)

1. Title I, Part A -- Improving Basic Programs Operated By LEAs [Goals 1,2,3,5]

- a. Identify the amount of the reservation in section 1003(a) for school improvement that the State will use for State-level activities and describe those activities.

MDE plans to use up to five percent of the funds for State-level activities to support the coordination of initiatives designed to assist low-performing schools and to provide professional development to ensure that these initiatives reflect scientifically based research and are carried out by highly qualified individuals. Collaborative planning and professional development supported with the State-level funds will involve the intermediate school district school improvement facilitators and the technical assistance providers for Title I schoolwide planning, CSRD, Reading First, and State-funded initiatives to improve low-performing schools. They will involve MDE staff who provide direct intensive assistance to low-performing schools, or who provide leadership for the coordination of these efforts. MDE will also be working with CEPI to coordinate the reporting required by NCLB.

- b. For the 95 percent of the reservation in section 1003(a) that must be made available to LEAs, describe how the SEA will allocate funds to assist LEAs in complying with the school improvement, corrective action, and restructuring requirements of section 1116 and identify any SEA requirements for use of those funds.

MDE will allocate at least 95 percent of the funds based on eligibility criteria that target the lowest-performing schools and result in allocations that are sufficient to have a significant impact on these schools. The specific criteria that will be used initially will be very similar to those used to allocate Title I school improvement funds in previous years. Incorporating results from the MI-Access alternate assessment will be discussed once the first MI-Access results are released in August 2002. The criteria for identifying schools for Title I School Improvement Funds for 2001 is as follows: For schools that meet the following criteria for the highest-grade level in the school in which the Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP) test is administered.

For at least two of the three subject areas of mathematics, reading and science:

1. Less than 25 percent of the students scored in the highest category – for the tests with four levels of achievement this would be level one (exceeded standards) and level two (met standards) combined, and

2. The school was also identified for Title I school improvement in the same subjects.

MDE will also continue the previous requirements for LEA use of the funds. These requirements stipulate that the funds must be used for technical assistance and professional development to implement either a nationally recognized comprehensive school reform program or a high quality locally developed comprehensive school improvement plan. Periodic reporting is required to ensure that recipients of the funds are making adequate progress in implementing their plans.

- c. Identify what part, if any, of State administrative funds the SEA will use for assessment development under section 1004 of the ESEA, and describe how those funds will be used.

The State of Michigan has used and will continue to use State funding as the primary source of funding for the Michigan Educational Assessment Program. In addition, Michigan will use the funds designated in Title VI, Part A Subsection (1) for expansion of the assessment system to meet the requirements of NCLB. Michigan will apply for a competitive grant under Title VI Flexibility and Accountability, Section 6112 to enhance its capability to serve and assess Limited English Proficient students and students with disabilities. The State is not planning to use other administrative funds appropriated under NCLB for assessment development. MI-Access, Michigan's Alternate Assessment Program, has been completely funded with IDEA funds, but additional funding will be necessary to implement the assessment requirements included in No Child Left Behind legislation (testing at grade 3-8 in mathematics, reading/English, language arts, and the science assessment requirement).

- d. Describe how the State will inform LEAs of the procedures they must use to distribute funds for schools to use for supplemental services under section 1167(e)(7) and the procedures for determining the amount to be used for this purpose.

MDE does not currently plan to distribute funds specifically for schools to use for supplemental services. However, schools that meet the eligibility criteria for funds reserved by MDE under Section 1003(a) will be permitted to use a portion of their allocation for supplemental services. The maximum allowable portion will be based on the requirements in Section 1116(e)(6), after the LEA has met its obligation under Section 1116(b)(10).

- e. Describe how the State will use the formula funds awarded under section 6113(b)(1) for the development and implementation of State assessments in accordance with section 6111.

The MEAP (Michigan Educational Assessment Program) tests all public school students in grades 4, 5, 7, 8, and 11. The 11th grade tests (HST – High School Tests) cover the academic areas of reading, writing, mathematics, science, and social studies. As required

by IDEA, MI-Access provides alternate assessments at the same grades as the general state assessment for students with disabilities for whom the Individualized Education Program Team determines that the MEAP or MEAP with assessment accommodations is not appropriate.

In grades 4, 5, 7, and 8, however, not all subject areas are tested. Reading and mathematics are tested in grades 4 and 7. Writing, science, and social studies are tested in grades 5 and 8. Furthermore, the MEAP tests are cumulative tests, measuring academic content taught and learned over a number of previous grade levels vs. in the particular year in which the test is given. MI-Access will also need to assess students at the additional grades that the MEAP will be assessing.

The formula grants under ESEA will therefore, need to be used to develop an entirely new testing framework for the State of Michigan, which will be built upon but which will also fundamentally change the current Michigan Educational Assessment System (MEAP, MI-Access, and English Language Learner Alternate Assessment (ELL-Access). Specifically, the funds will be used to:

- Develop grade-level guides for the particular objectives that each year's tests will assess.
- Develop or purchase test items aligned to Michigan's Curriculum Framework Content Standards and Benchmarks.
- Contract for technical assistance for the design of the tests.
- Develop technical specifications for the tests.
- Contract for assistance in assuring the congruence of the grade level tests with the Michigan Curriculum Framework and Benchmarks.
- Contract for technical assistance in merging/aligning ESEA testing with the current MEAP and MI-Access assessment program.
- Develop and implement a system to tryout and pilot the new tests prior to 2005-06.
- Redesign the reporting formats currently used for the MEAP tests.
- Develop a unique identifying code (UIC) system for students to enable student progress to be tracked over time and with student mobility.
- Store MEAP data in the MEIS warehouse so that adequate yearly progress and student improvement can be determined.
- Develop new test scoring and reporting processes to reflect the requirements of ESEA.
- Develop tracking codes for the student subgroups specified in ESEA, e.g., English language learners, migrant students.
- Design and coordinate a system to assess English language proficiency in all local school districts and public school academies.
- Develop a web-based reporting function for the delivery of test results.

Generally, apply technology to provide speedier results to districts, schools, students, and parents.

2. Title I, Part B, Subpart 3 -- Even Start Family Literacy [Goals 1,2,5]

- a. Describe how the SEA will use its indicators of program quality to monitor, evaluate, and improve its projects, and to decide whether to continue operating them.

The guiding legislation required the State to develop, implement, monitor, evaluate and improve local programs using data collected on outcomes that were termed “indicators of program quality.” Development of the indicators was completed in June 2001, with all programs implementing data collection and reporting for the 2001-2002 pilot year. The indicators can only be achieved in high quality programs. Thus on-site monitoring will focus upon the quality aspects of program implementation, as well as compliance with the legislation. Programs will be encouraged to use the Guide to Quality for Even Start (RMC 2002) for an annual self-assessment. A matrix that takes into account the longevity of the program, the implementation model, and the indicators will assist in determining continuation of funding. Local programs will be discontinued if necessary, but only after targeted technical assistance has been provided. Grant procedures exist to guide the required notification of intent to discontinue and ability of local grantees to request a hearing for programs that, after assistance, monitoring, and evaluation, are not reaching the targeted outcomes.

- b. Describe what constitutes sufficient program progress when the SEA makes continuation awards.

The matrix mentioned above will include specific expectations of the performance and progress of the local programs. MDE will require that the local programs report at least three percentage points of gain within one year of the report of outcomes for the adults and children enrolled in Even Start programs. The further a program is from reaching the targeted outcomes and the longer a program has been implemented, the greater the expectation of the gain over the course of the year. If after one year of monitoring and technical assistance the program is found to be far from reaching the targets, MDE will notify the program of the intent to discontinue funding. The process of notification, hearing, and the MDE response can take up to six months, during which time the program may attempt to improve practice and provide interim statistics to show progress. The actions to discontinue would be suspended and the program would then be placed on a probationary or high alert status with more intensive scrutiny during the next six months, placing the program in the same annual review cycle as the other local programs.

- c. Explain how the State’s Even Start projects will provide assistance to low-income families participating in the program to help children in those families to achieve to the applicable State content and student achievement standards.

All proposals for Even Start funding are required to discuss the capacity of the project to assist children in achieving the state standards. Overall, the framework for succeeding in this assistance relies on the quality of the project services and the project’s ability to dispense high quality programming built on the research most appropriate for the age of children being served. The subsequent review of the stated goals and objectives of the

project with regard to this ability allows the MDE staff to consider technical assistance to the local project to assure its success. Practically all of the projects are working with children in the years prior to school entry. Therefore, training modules focus on strategies to support early language as well as the definition and development of comprehensive early literacy and readiness skills. One of the outcome indicators requires the projects to regularly assess children's development so that concerns about delays are addressed and children receive necessary support in areas of concern. All Even Start projects encourage and support parents of children in the early grades to work closely with the elementary school faculty and staff to assure children's success. Even Start projects may arrange for additional tutelage of the children or bilingual Even Start staff are asked by parents to attend school conferences with the parents to ensure two-way communication. The unique aspects of each family and the unique service delivery of each local project create a myriad of methods to assist the success of enrolled children.

- d. Identify the amount of the reservation under subsection 1233(a) that the State will use for each category of State-level activities listed in that section, and describe how the SEA will carry out those activities.

The State will reserve three percent of its Even Start grant for the following activities:

- Administration, including items such as state level staff, activities related to the notification of fund availability, competition to determine dissemination of funds, dissemination activities, monitoring, and evaluation of local projects.
- Professional development and conferencing activities that support the development of Even Start local projects.

The State will reserve an additional three percent of its Even Start grant for the following activities:

- Subgrants or contracts to known providers for technical assistance designed to help local projects improve the quality of Even Start services or to further revise, improve, and implement the State's indicators of program quality.
- Subgrants or contracts to known providers for technical assistance designed to help local projects raise additional funds to support the activities funded through Even Start.

3. Title I, Part C -- Education of Migrant Children [Goals 1,2,5]

- a. Describe the process the State will use to develop, implement, and document a comprehensive needs assessment that identifies the special educational and related needs of migrant children.

During 2002-2003, the state will establish a Migrant Needs Assessment Committee comprised of key stakeholders from MDE, LEAs, parents, students, and other governmental agencies playing a key role in migrant education. The committee will guide a needs assessment correlating the academic goals of both general and migrant education programs with the current status of those goals. The needs assessment will consider data from test scores, school involvement, family background, academic progress, and health indicators, as well as information considered key to the local needs

assessments. REP will provide data on professional development resources that teachers of migrant students utilize. An analysis of the data will assist in the development of a research-based plan to guide the state's migrant education programs.

A needs assessment of LEA personnel will determine the need for professional development activities specific to teachers of migrant students that will strengthen their ability to support student achievement of the academic goals. During the 2003-2004 school year, the resulting plan will be implemented statewide. Formative evaluations will assist in determining the effectiveness of the plan and any corrections that may need to be made. Data gathered from the 2004-2005 school year will form the basis for a revised plan. The three-year cycle will yield a rich source of data for the progress of migrant students through the Michigan educational system. The process will repeat itself in a continuous three-year cycle, utilizing annual analysis of formative data to modify the long-term plan on an annual basis.

- b. Describe the State's priorities for the use of migrant education program funds in order to have migrant students meet the State's performance targets for indicators 1.1 and 1.2 in Part I (as well as 5.1 and 5.2 that expressly include migrant students), and how they relate to the State's assessment of needs for services.

During the 2002-2003 school year (and continuing), the state will collect data related to all of the areas mentioned above. Analysis of the data will assist, when coupled with the needs assessment mentioned in 2a, to determine the educational needs of the migrant student and assist in determining what weight should be given to these issues in combination with other factors when allocating funds to the LEAs and other agencies. School districts and buildings not meeting AYP factors for the migrant student will be identified for technical assistance. The state will provide technical assistance both from the Title I, Part A funds and from Title I, Part C funds to support assistance to those schools.

Additional question from and information provided to the US ED:

Does the state acknowledge its responsibility to disaggregate the data by each subgroup listed in 1111(h)(1)(c)(i) which includes "migrant students" connection between the results of the statewide needs assessment and the Migrant Education Program (MEP) funding priorities? (State how the needs assessment has helped to improve the migrant program)

The state acknowledges its responsibility to disaggregate data by each subgroup and is prepared to do so. The data from any migrant student tested through the Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP) is used to assess the effectiveness of the educational program in the LEA and the individual needs of the student. These data are utilized in state and federal accountability programs such as Education YES! and the performance indicators identified in the Consolidated Application. The data identify the performance of migrant students at the building and LEA levels. The aggregate data

provide performance information for migrant students across the state. These data drive the design and implementation of subsequent migrant service delivery programs.

- c. Describe how the State will determine the amount of any subgrants the State will award to local operating agencies, taking into account the numbers and needs of migrant children, the statutory priority for service in section 1304(d), and the availability of funds from other federal, State, and local programs. (Applicable only if not previously addressed in Part II, #2.)

MDE will utilize the existing criteria that rely on the impact of high inter- and intrastate mobility as an initial determiner of subgrants. Data gathered from statewide assessments and housed in CEPI's STAR and other indicators in 2001-2002 and 2002-2003 school years will assist in determining additional educational student needs not being met through other state, federal, and local programs. Additionally, an instrument will be devised to assist in determining issues faced by students who are monolingual and lacking in literacy skills as well. Following a review of the data, the MDE will consider an adjustment to the formula utilized for awarding subgrants to LEAs and other agencies.

Additional question from and information provided to the US ED:

Has the state described its subgranting process for the MEP? (Need to address the four criteria factors and how they are weighted.) Along with the number of migratory children, the needs of migratory children, statutory priority for service, and availability of other funds must be taken into account for the subgranting formula. Has the state provide timelines in the process for the awarding MEP subgrants? (Supply a calendar of processing dates, not just award dates.)

In determining the amount of any subgrants awarded to LEAs, MDE will take into account the following funding factors: (1) the number of migratory children, (2) the needs of the migratory children, (3) the priority of services of these children under subsection 1304 (d), and (4) the availability of funds from other programs. The State will continue with its approved funding formula through the 2002-03 school year. Following completion of the needs assessment, the State will complete and submit to the US ED by May 2003, the required description of how both as a process and timeline, these factors will be weighted and included in the State's determination of its subgrants.

Additional question form and information provided to the US ED:

Does the MEP formula include other factors that affect the subgranting formula? (Explain how the formula improves academic achievement and justify how this will result in the appropriate distribution of Title I, Part C funds.)

Data concerning migrant students are taken into consideration in state and federal programs and initiatives. Those initiatives that assess the quality and effectiveness of a school or LEA consider the achievement of all students in the aggregate and discrete data

determine program effectiveness for sub-populations, including migrant students. Districts, schools, and programs identified as needing varying levels of technical assistance through programs such as the state's accountability system, Education YES!, and Title I School Improvement buildings are expected to identify the research-based strategies that will improve the achievement levels of all affected populations, including migrant students.

- d. Describe how the State will promote continuity of education and the interstate and intrastate coordination of services for migrant children.

The state will work closely with the states and countries from which students migrate to Michigan. The work will begin first with Texas, which is the key "stream" from which Michigan's migrant students come. Identification of key issues surrounding curriculum, benchmarks, statewide assessments, credit accrual, communication of individual student records and learning issues, and mobility issues will be discussed. A plan for resolving issues and delivery of services will be devised and implemented. The Texas component will be completed by Summer 2003 and implemented in the 2003-2004 school year. Evaluation of effectiveness will begin with that school year and continue. Key indicators of success will be a closer working relationship between stakeholders in the two states and a reduction in barriers to sharing student achievement, credit accrual, and graduation records. The state will follow the same model with other states and countries in succeeding years, based on the percentage of migrant students coming to Michigan from those states and countries. Migrant data will be gathered in coordination with CEPI.

Working with LEA migrant Directors and teachers, the state will address issues facing students engaged in intrastate migration. Preliminary evidence appears to identify the key issues around migrating students are the same as those issues faced by all highly mobile, lower socio-economic students within the state. Collaboration within MDE to access services key to overcoming issues faced by the mobile poor will make best use of available state and federal programs and funds. Statewide assessments will assist in determining key educational issues facing migrant students and their teachers. A long term, coached professional development series will be developed to meet the identified needs.

Additional question from and information provided to the US ED:

Did the state include the MEP in its stat-level coordination? (Provide names of several state programs and activities that the MEP is involved with, both interstate and intrastate, to promote the efficient and coordinated delivery of services to migrant children.)

The State currently participates in the following programs and activities to promote collaboration and coordination of services: Interstate Migrant Education Council, National Association of State Directors of Migrant Education, ESCORT, the Bi-national Program, the state's CAMP program, Telemon (a provider of pre-school and career preparation services for migrant students), Interagency Migrant Services Council (a state-level coordination council designed to bring state and national level agencies working

within Michigan together for the purposes of serving migrant families and students), formal collaborative efforts with Texas, and coordination of state and federal programs such as Title I, Title II, Title III, Title V, state at-risk, state bilingual, statewide assessment, and data collection. Following the completion of the needs assessment in Spring 2003, those programs and initiatives identified for further collaboration and coordination will be included in the State's efforts to improve services to migrant students.

- e. Describe the State's plan to evaluate the effectiveness of its migrant education program and projects.

Following the completion of the initial comprehensive needs assessment (see 2a), MDE will utilize a migrant education program committee to determine the key factors essential to evaluation of the effectiveness of the migrant education program and projects. The migrant education program committee will be comprised of key stakeholders from the MDE, LEAs, parents, students, and other governmental agencies playing a key role in migrant education. Key factors to be considered by the committee will focus on academic achievement, school completion, drop out rate, and coordination of interstate and intrastate factors affecting migrant students. The evaluation plan will be applied to migrant programs and projects in coordination with the implementation of statewide plan during the 2004-2005 school year.

- f. Identify the amount of funds that the SEA will retain from its Migrant Education Program (MEP) allocation, under section 200.41 of the Title I regulations (34 CFR 200.41), to carry out administrative and program functions that are unique to the MEP, and describe how the SEA will use those funds.

The State retains 1% of the Migrant program grant award amount for administration. During the 2001-2002 fiscal year, an additional amount of \$199,600 of the Migrant statewide funds was used at the State level. Although the 2002-2003 budget has not yet been prepared, a comparable amount (\$199,600) of the statewide funds will be used at the state level. These funds are used for administrative expense of reviewing applications, providing technical assistance, and monitoring programs. The Migrant Education Programs are monitored through a two-tiered review process by the Office of Field Services that is described in the response to question #3 under "State Activities to Implement ESEA Programs." The funds are also used for professional development activities, data collection, and data reporting. In addition, state level funds are used to support the efforts to coordinate interstate activities for services to migrant students; intrastate, interagency services; and membership in the Interstate Migrant Advisory Council.

- 4. Title I, Part D -- Children and Youth who are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk [Goals 1,2,5]

- a. Describe the program goals, performance indicators, performance objectives, and data sources that the State has established for its use in assessing the effectiveness of the program in improving the academic and vocational and technical skills of students participating in the program.

The academic achievement standards for students participating in Title I, Part D programs are the same as those for all other students in the state. The statewide accountability system is designed to include alternative measures for students whose focus is vocational and technical education, so that these programs are held equally accountable for the success of their students. The accountability system described in Section 1g under "State Activities to Implement ESEA Programs" will be used to assess the effectiveness of Title I, Part D programs that serve students for at least one full year. Short-term programs will establish their own program goals, performance indicators, performance objectives, and data sources based on their specific purposes and circumstances. Students with disabilities in correctional facilities receive special education programs and services including transition services from Michigan's Department of Corrections and the Family Independence Agency. Both agencies describe transition services in a written plan describing the delivery of special education programs and services. The current plan was revised by both agencies for the 2000-2001 school year. The Department of Corrections Plan states: "During the Individualized Education Planning Team (IEPT) discussion regarding transition of the special education prisoner may include transferring from the special education resource room to parole or discharge into the community. At this IEPT, the Michigan Rehabilitation Services may be invited, as well as a knowledgeable member of the community into which the prisoner shall return, for information regarding, jobs, recreation, schooling, etc."

The Family Independence Agency Plan indicates several options for clients, including integration into the community, attendance at the local public schools, and/or community activities where the center is located. Students with disabilities who are receiving day treatment programs continue to live in their natural homes. These students are grouped by grade level and abilities and participate in academics together and in a variety of recreational and treatment activities working toward a return to the community.

- b. Describe how the SEA is assisting projects funded under the program in facilitating the transition of youth from correctional facilities to locally operated programs.

Institutions for juvenile offenders are operated by the Michigan Family Independence Agency. Title I, Part D program oversight and technical assistance are provided to these institutions through the Office of Field Service's integrated monitoring process (On Site Review). A representative from the Family Independence Agency's Bureau of Juvenile Justice joins the MDE review team for the site visits. As part of the site visit, institution staff describe and discuss their transition services. The MDE review team identifies best practices at each institution and makes recommendations for program improvement. Follow-up activities are coordinated through the Family Independence Agency. In addition, the Family Independence Agency is required to evaluate its programs at least

once every three years and submit its evaluation results to MDE. This evaluation includes a determination of the programs' impact on the ability of participants to make the transition to locally operated programs.

- c. Describe how the funds reserved under section 1418 will be used for transition services for students leaving institutions for schools served by LEAs, or postsecondary institutions, or vocational and technical training programs.

The Michigan Family Independence Agency operates group homes and transition centers to serve youth after they leave the correctional institutions and return to the local community. The Family Independence Agency will budget at least 15 percent and not more than 30 percent to support transition services as detailed in section 1418.

5. Title I, Part F -- Comprehensive School Reform [Goals 1,2 5]

- a. Describe the process the State educational agency will use to ensure that programs funded include and integrate all eleven required components of a comprehensive school reform program.

The schools funded for Comprehensive School Reform (CSR) must submit a plan that includes and integrates all of the eleven required components of a comprehensive school reform program.

For the CSR complete request for proposal, go to:

http://www.michigan.gov/mde/1,1607,7-140-6525_6530_6559-21417--,00.html

This is the grant application used to award grants for the 2002-03 school year. The application clearly indicates the requirement that all applications address the eleven components. The Office of Field Services in MDE provides technical assistance to all CSR schools that includes monitoring of the progress of the reform measures that each school is working to implement.

- b. Describe the process the State will use to determine the percentage of Comprehensive School Reform schools with increasing numbers of students meeting or exceeding the proficient level of performance on State assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics.

The responses to questions 1.1 and 1.2 in the section of the application entitled "ESEA Performance Goals, Performance Indicators, and State Performance Targets," explain that the State adopted a new accountability system in March 2002. The State Board of Education approved the membership of an expert Accreditation Advisory Committee in April 2002. The Accreditation Advisory Committee will be meeting to make recommendations about the specific achievement measures and levels that will be used for the accountability system. The measurements and calculations will be completed and reported to schools and school districts by December 2002. It is at this point in time that MDE will be able to calculate the percentage of Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration program schools that meet or exceed the proficient level of performance on the State's assessments in reading and mathematics and on the MI-Access.

Information on the percentage of CSR schools that meet or exceed the proficient level of performance on State assessments in reading and mathematics will be available in December 2002.

6. Title II, Part A -- Teacher and Principal Training and Recruiting Fund [Goals 1,2,3,5]

- a. If not fully addressed in the State's response to the information on performance goals, indicators, and targets in Part I, describe the remainder of the State's annual measurable objectives under section 1119(a)(2).

The percentage of all teachers of core academic subjects within the state that are highly qualified will increase by 30% in 2003-2004 and in each subsequent year to meet the requirement that all teachers of core academic subjects will be highly qualified not later than the end of the 2005-2006 school year. Data managed by CEPI (REP) will be used to establish the baseline for core academic subjects.

- b. Describe how the SEA will hold LEAs accountable both for (1) meeting the annual measurable objectives described in section 1119(a)(2) of the ESEA, and (2) ensuring that the professional development the LEAs offer their teachers and other instructional staff is consistent with the definition of "professional development" in section 9101(34).

Note: This program, and the financial support it provides to States, LEAs, and schools, is vitally important to ensure that all students have teachers who are highly qualified, and who can help students achieve to their maximum capabilities. The two items identified above supplement other information States need to provide in response to items in Part I, Goal 3; Part II, item 5, and Part III, information on Title II, Part D (Enhancing Education Through Technology program) on how they plan to implement key teacher quality activities.

MDE will cooperate with CEPI for the collection of REP data. MDE will develop procedures to hold LEA's accountable for meeting the above measurable objectives for ensuring that all teachers of core academic subjects are highly qualified by the end of 2005-2006. MDE will provide technical assistance to meet this objective and sanction LEAs and Public school academies (PSAs) that do not comply.

As part of the monitoring process for programs funded under this Act, LEA, and PSA staff are asked to demonstrate that their professional development activities are aligned with the model core curriculum and are for the areas where students have the greatest academic need.

MDE will convene all key stakeholders in early Fall 2002 to set in motion the design and implementation of four state activities as described in section 2113 (c). The activities may include the following, but the various stakeholders will determine the specific activities in the fall. The final plan will support Title I programs.

- 1) Developing systems to measure the effectiveness of specific professional development programs and strategies to document gains in student academic achievement or increases in teacher mastery in deep understanding of content;
 - 2) Developing and assisting local educational agencies in the development and use of proven, innovative strategies to deliver intensive professional development programs;
 - 3) Supporting activities that ensure that teachers are able to use challenging State academic content standards and
 - 4) Establishing and operating a center that designs and carries out programs to improve teacher recruitment and retention.
- c. Describe the State Educational Agency and the State Agency for Higher Education's agreement on the amount each will retain under section 2113(d) of ESEA. Section 2113(d) allows for one percent of the State's program allocation for administration and planning costs.

Michigan does not have a State Agency for Higher Education. Those funds are managed by the Michigan Department of Education. Thus, MDE will retain the funds under section 2113(d) and will use the state's one percent for administration and planning costs.

7. Title II, Part D -- Enhanced Education Through Technology [Goals 1,2,3]

- a. Describe the program goals, performance indicators, performance objectives, and data sources that the State has established for its use in assessing the effectiveness of the program in improving access to and use of educational technology by students and teachers in support of academic achievement.

Additional information provided to the US ED:

Michigan's State Technology Plan (1998) Update 2000 clearly supports standards for student literacy in technology through Recommendation #3 and identified that 75% of districts had written guidelines related to technology skills for graduating students. The Update 2000 identified steps including the review of the K-12 technology education competencies as well as the instructional technology applications across the curriculum. To move toward meeting the goal of identifying the percentage of students meeting or exceeding the technology standards, Michigan is planning to

By Sept. 30, 2002

- Complete review/revision of technology standards and align with the National Educational Technology Standards for Students developed by the International Society for Technology in Education in collaboration with US ED.
- Develop a process and tool for assessing the level of awareness and understanding by teachers of the technology content standards.
- Develop an instrument to assess student level of proficiency for the technology standards.

By January 31, 2003

- Develop a plan and associated materials for providing professional development for teachers and administrators about the technology standards and how to implement them within the context of their curriculum.
 - Begin to gather baseline assessment data on student proficiencies of the state technology standards.
 - Identify barriers to student success and strategies to overcome those barriers to increase the percentage of student competencies.
 - Develop a timeline and target percentages for students meeting technology standards.
- b. Provide a brief summary of the SEA's long-term strategies for improving student academic achievement, including technology literacy, through the effective use of technology in the classroom, and the capacity of teachers to integrate technology effectively into curricula and instruction.

Michigan's current state [technology plan](#) recognizes that research was showing that a technology-rich learning environment can impact student attitudes and performance. Effective technology integration into the curriculum coupled with professional development for teachers is strongly emphasized in the Plan. These recommendations have been implemented through statewide professional development opportunities on integrating technology into the curriculum offered through the Michigan Technology Implementation Project, the Ameritech Technology Academy project, Michigan Virtual University, and technology planning workshops for districts emphasizing comprehensive components for technology integration, professional development, and evaluation. To build upon successes, Michigan will move toward the following:

By June 30, 2002

- Submit to the State Board of Education for approval revised Teaching and Learning Standards consistent with the Technology Content Standards.
- Begin work on the Michigan Curriculum Framework revisions.

By June 30, 2003

- Implement a data collection process with CEPI using the School Infrastructure Database (SID): Technology section, to help determine the definitions and type of technology that is available in the learning environment.
- Continue enhancement of the instructional tool, Clarifying Language in Michigan's Benchmarks (MI-CLiMB) to include instructional examples on the application of technologies within each curriculum area.
- Develop a plan that will provide guidance to teachers and administrators for effective use of technology in the curriculum to improve student performance. This plan would include best practices of integration, guidelines for assessing effective professional development programs for technology integration, district technology planning and assessment, and activities as proposed in the Michigan School Aid Act [Section 98].

The Office of Special Education and Early Intervention Services supports assistive technology and the concept of universal instructional technology for all learners. This

universal design approach targets the educational needs of all students while addressing different learning styles. Technology plays an important role by offering adaptability and flexibility. Technology creates a path of discovery and learning that assists and benefits all learners. The following are recommended procedures:

- Convene a focus group of diverse representatives to define need, identify direction, and locate research.
- Convene an expert group to identify provider competencies and establish guides for the implementation of instructional technology.

Additional information provided to the US ED:

Michigan's Technology Plan was updated in 2000 and is currently undergoing a review for compliance with the new legislation. The next update is scheduled to be finalized during 2003.

- c. Describe key activities that the SEA will conduct or sponsor with the funds it retains at the State level. These may include such activities as provision of distance learning in rigorous academic courses or curricula; the establishment or support of public-private initiatives for the acquisition of technology by high-need LEAs; and the development of performance measurement systems to determine the effectiveness of educational technology programs.

The MDE will promote pilot activities that utilize cutting-edge technology and support public-private initiatives for the acquisition of technology by high-need LEAs. Additionally, funds will be used to develop performance measurement systems that will determine the effectiveness of educational technology programs.

- d. Provide a brief description of how –
 - i. The SEA will ensure that students and teachers, particularly those in the schools of high-need LEAs, have increased access to technology, and

By September 30, 2002

--Implementation of data collection process with CEPI using the SID: Technology section to establish the baseline from which one can determine the degree of increased access.

- ii. The SEA will coordinate the application and award process for State discretionary grant and formula grant funds under this program.

Three Offices within the Michigan Department of Education are responsible for the awarding of grants. The Office of Field Services awards all of the formula grants and the Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration program competitive grant. The Office of School Excellence and the Office of Budget, Contracts, and Grants award all of the remaining discretionary grants. The grants program within the Office of Budget, Contracts and Grants has developed an extensive system for approving and processing all grants (both state and federal) in a consistent manner and in a consistent format. These

three offices work in close cooperation in developing grant criteria and in planning grant programs. The representatives of the office frequently participate on the advisory groups for the grants administered by the other offices. Additionally, the MDE process of having the State Board of Education approve all grant criteria assures that the criteria are widely disseminated.

MDE has a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with MVU for the distribution of approximately 40% of the competitive grant portion of this program. (It may be found at: http://www.michigan.gov/documents/MVU_MOU_final_draft_35297_7.doc) This MOU details how MDE and MVU will collaborate for the purpose of increasing technology access for all students and teachers.

Additional information provided to the US ED:

The Ed Tech funds identified in the MOU with MVU under “grants” are competitive Ed Tech funds and will be issued only to those LEAs that meet poverty eligibility requirements. The administration of the grant program identified above will be contracted to MVU, as identified in the MOU.

Additional information provided to the US ED:

Through Recommendations #3 and #10, Michigan's State Technology Plan (1998) Update 2000 clearly sets direction for working toward equitable access to technology-delivered learning opportunities and resource for all students. CEPI has the structure (metadata and software) for the School Infrastructure Database (SID) ready to collect the related data from schools, which includes information on networks. To progress toward identifying the schools where all students have access to a networked computer, through collaboration across agencies, Michigan plans to:

By June 30, 2002

--Develop a timeline and procedure for collection of data from schools.

--Outline strategies for how the data will be used to bridge the digital divide, providing more access to a networked computer by more students as well as insure that instructional resources accessed align with the Michigan Curriculum Framework with the goal of improving student achievement across the curriculum.

By September. 30, 2002

--Implement data collection process.

By January 31, 2003

--Publish baseline data and implement the action plan developed in June.

8. Title III, Part A -- English Language Acquisition and Language Enhancement [Goals 1,2,3,5]

- a. Describe how the SEA will ensure that LEAs use program funds only to carry out activities that reflect scientifically based research on the education of limited English proficient children while allowing LEAs flexibility (to the extent

permitted under State law) to select and implement such activities in a manner that the grantees determine best reflects local needs and circumstances.

MDE's Office of Field Services has employed the advice and recommendations of ad hoc advisory groups comprised of the state's educators of Limited English Proficient (LEP) students to develop policy, delivery systems, proficiency measures, and data collection. A comparable advisory group will be established to address the educational goals and proficiency measures that are included in Title III, Part A. This advisory group will participate in the identification of best practices for the acquisition of English language proficiency and in planning of professional development and technical assistance to help implement effective research based practices. This advisory group will begin its work in June 2002 and will continue to work throughout the 2002-2003 school year. The group will identify the most effective methods for disseminating information to school districts that serve LEP students, e.g., workshops, conferences, manuals, and websites.

MDE's Office of Field Services will continue to monitor the implementation of the programs funded through this section as described in the response to question #3 under the heading entitled "State Activities to Implement ESEA Programs." The two-tiered monitoring process, described in #3, is how the State will ensure that subgrantees use program funds only to carry out activities that reflect scientifically based research on the education of limited English proficient children.

- b. Describe how the SEA will hold LEAs accountable for meeting all annual measurable achievement objectives for limited English proficient children and for making adequate yearly progress that raises the achievement of limited English proficient children.

The advisory group for the education of LEP students (see 8.a. above) will assist in the development of annual measurable achievement objectives and a system to assure the accountability of subgrantees. This system will be developed and disseminated during the 2002-2003 school year. School districts serving LEP students will be receiving initial English language proficiency data for their students during the 2002-2003 school year and will be able to use the data to develop their plans for meeting measurable objectives in the next school year. Once the annual measurable achievement objectives for LEP students are established as described in item 1j of the State Activities section, LEAs will report their progress annually. LEP students who participate in the MEAP assessment with and without accommodations will have their assessment results disaggregated to show AYP as well as having their assessment results included in the local aggregate and disaggregated reports using data located in the MEIS Warehouse. Schools that do not show progress for LEP students will be identified for improvement and provided with technical assistance.

MDE will follow US ED guidance for providing technical assistance and include this type of assistance in the Office of Field Service "tool kit" of technical assistance options which currently includes On Site Reviews (comprehensive reviews of all consolidated programs) and in-depth program assistance provided by specialized consultants. Annual

and bi-annual reports will be submitted to US ED for AYP and for student achievement objectives as required by legislation.

- c. Specify the percentage of the State's allotment that the State will reserve and the percentage of the reserved funds that the State will use for each of the following categories of State-level activities: professional development; planning, evaluation, administration, and interagency coordination; technical assistance; and providing recognition to subgrantees that have exceeded their annual measurable achievement objectives. A total amount not to exceed 5 percent of the State's allotment may be reserved by the State under section 3111(b)(2) to carry out one or more of these categories of State-level activities.

MDE will reserve 5% of the state allotment for the following state level activities:

Administration 20%

Technical Assistance 35%

Professional Development 30%

Planning and evaluation 5%

Recognition 10%

Consolidated Funds- To be determined after MDE receives approval for a Waiver.

- d. Specify the percentage of the State's allotment that the State will reserve for subgrants to eligible entities that have experienced a significant increase in the percentage or number of immigrant children and youth. A total amount not to exceed 15 percent of the State's allotment must be reserved by the State under section 3114(d)(1) to award this type of subgrant.

The state will reserve 15% of the Title III allotment to distribute to LEAs that experience a significant increase in the percentage or number of immigrant children and youth.

- e. Describe the process that the State will use in making subgrants under section 3114(d) to LEAs that have experienced a significant increase in the percentage or number of immigrant children and youth.

The state will reserve 15% of the Title III allotment to distribute to LEAs that experience a significant increase in the percentage or number of immigrant children and youth. The state will examine the count of immigrant students in LEAs for the two preceding school years to see the trend in immigrant student population increases. It is not uncommon for several LEAs to experience a substantial increase in immigrant students each school year. Funds for the immigrant program will be distributed based on a per student formula to LEAs experiencing the greatest increase. Funds will be distributed so as to provide a grant award that is substantial enough to carry out the program described in the LEA's plan.

Additional information provided to the US ED:

MDE will look at the increases in immigrant student population for the whole state in the Single Record Student Database and at the increases in each school district to see the trends. Title III immigrant funds will be distributed to school districts that experience an increase in immigrant population that is greater than the average increase for the state or an increase of at least 10%, whichever is less. Funds will be allocated on a per pupil basis to eligible districts or PSAs, as defined above, with an increase of at least 10 immigrant students. Applications from eligible entities with limited or no experience serving immigrant students, but with a sudden influx of immigrant students, will be accepted for funding along with applications from LEAs with programs already in place.

- f. Specify the number of limited English proficient children in the State. (See definitions of "child" in section 3301(1), and "limited English proficient" in section 9101(25).)

As reported for school year 2001-02, there are 47,252 LEP K-12 students.

- g. Provide the most recent data available on the number of immigrant children and youth in the State. (See definition of "immigrant children and youth" in section 3301(6).)
(Note: Section 3111 of the ESEA requires that State allocations for the Language Acquisition State grants be calculated on the basis of the number of limited English proficient children in the State compared to the number of such children in all States (80 percent) and the number of immigrant children and youth in the State compared to the number of such children and youth in all States (20 percent). The Department plans to use data from the 2000 Census to calculate State shares of limited English proficient students. However, these data on limited English proficient students will not be available for all States until September 2002. To ensure that States have access to funds as soon as they are available, the Department proposes, for FY 2002 only, to provide an initial distribution of 50 percent of the funds under the limited English proficient portion of the formula based on CEPI student data. As soon as Census data become available, the Department will recalculate and make final State allocations using 2000 Census data. For the 20 percent of formula funds distributed to States based on State shares of immigrant children and youth, the Department will use the most recent State-reported data year in allocating these funds. Census does not collect data that can be used to calculate State allocations for this part of the formula.)

LEAs reported 10,309 immigrant children and youth for school year 2001-02.

9. Title IV, Part A -- Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities

- a. Describe the key strategies in the State's comprehensive plan for the use of funds by the SEA and the Governor of the State to provide safe, orderly, and drug-free schools and communities through programs and activities that –
 - i. Complement and support activities of LEAs under section 4115(b) of the

ESEA;

The Title IV, Part A funds are administered by the Office of Drug Control Policy (ODCP), the State agency designated by the Chief Executive Officer as the lead agency for drug policy in Michigan. The director of the ODCP also serves as Michigan's Drug Czar. ODCP works in collaboration with the MDE Office of Safe Schools and other State agencies involved in preventing drug use and violence among our youth and in providing treatment for mental health and other public health problems. ODCP has effectively administered this program for approximately 10 years.

As part of ODCP's strategic planning process, Michigan's drug and violence prevention strategy is currently under revision. A comprehensive plan to provide safe, orderly, and drug-free schools and communities is being developed.

In the interim,

Michigan will provide local LEAs, ISDs, and subgrantees with training on the following topics: (1) identifying the safety needs of its elementary, middle, and secondary school teachers, students, and buildings; (2) evaluation, data collection, and analysis of the incidence of violence and illegal drugs in school in coordination with CEPI; (3) Title IV, Part A and Principles of Effectiveness, and (4) selecting appropriate scientifically-based research programs that have shown to be effective.

Michigan will continue to work with its ISDs and LEAs and encourage and support collaboration with the local community and parents to reduce illegal drug use and violence in the state. ODCP will sponsor and help develop state conferences and workshops that will bring together the schools, community-based agencies, law enforcement, courts, and other state agencies interested in the reduction of illegal drug use and violence in the schools. Technical assistance will be provided through the offices of ODCP. Education consultants and contract consultants will be available to assist LEAs and ISDs with program, planning, and evaluation. Schools in Michigan that have successfully implemented research- and science-based programs will be showcased in workshops and promoted statewide. Districts with similar needs and demographics will be encouraged to use the same program.

- ii. Comply with the principles of effectiveness under section 4115(a); and

Each application for Title IV, Part A funds is reviewed for compliance with the principles of effectiveness. Subgrantees will not receive Title IV, Part A funds unless compliance is well documented. All subgrantees must demonstrate compliance in meaningful consultation with parents in the development of the application and the administration of the program; identify performance measures related to reducing violence and illegal drug use in schools; and identify appropriate measurement tools that will measure behavior and attitude change. In addition, Michigan subgrantees

will be required to adopt the core goals required by the US ED, in addition to Michigan-specific goals.

ODCP will continue to monitor the implementation of the programs funded through this section yearly and conduct onsite visits as appropriate. Focused monitoring and technical assistance will be provided, as needed. Monitoring will include records review; interviews with staff, students, parents, and community members; review of evaluation; and monitoring of funded programs and activity. At the end of each grant year, each subgrantee must demonstrate program effectiveness with an annual report detailing evidence of its success, including, but not limited to, performance measures and its achievements.

Training and technical assistance will be offered, as needed, to fully comply with the principles of effectiveness.

iii. Otherwise are in accordance with the purpose of Title IV, Part A.

All funded activity will comply with provisions of Title IV, Part A. The Governor's Program and the Title IV, Part A funds are administered by the Office of Drug Control Policy (ODCP). ODCP administers the prevention funds available under the federal Substance Abuse and Mental Health Administration block grant and the U.S. Department of Justice, Byrne Memorial Formula Grant funds.

Accordingly, the ODCP assures that the Title IV, Part A program is well coordinated with other state agencies. ODCP collaborates with a host of different state and local agencies to increase academic achievement and to assure that all students will be educated in learning environments that are safe, drug free, and conducive to learning.

(Note: The reauthorized provisions of the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (SDFSC) Program clearly emphasize well-coordinated SEA and Governor's Program activities. The statute requires that significant parts of the program application be developed for each State's program, not for the SEA and Governor's Programs individually. For this reason, each State must submit a single application for SDFSC SEA and Governor's Program funds. States may choose to apply for SDFSC funding through this consolidated application or through a program-specific application.)

b. Describe the State's performance measures for drug and violence prevention programs and activities to be funded under Title IV, Part A, Subpart 1. These performance measures must focus on student behaviors and attitudes. They must consist of performance indicators for drug and violence prevention programs and activities and levels of performance for each performance indicator. The description must also include timelines for achieving the performance goals stated, details about what mechanism the State will use to collect data concerning the indicators, and provide baseline data for indicators (if available).

The state performance measures will be determined by January 2003, after the MDE and Office of Drug Control Policy complete a comprehensive needs assessment.

- c. Describe the steps the State will use to implement the Uniform Management Information and Reporting System (UMIRS) required by section 4112(c)(3). The description should include information about which agency(ies) will be responsible for implementing the UMIRS, a tentative schedule for implementing the UMIRS requirements, as well as preliminary plans for collecting required information.

1. MDE and the Office of Drug Control Policy have collaborated with representatives of Michigan's Center for Educational Performance and Information (CEPI) to outline the necessary steps necessary to gather and report the crime and safety data required by section 4112 (c)(3).

CEPI is Michigan's single source for comprehensive, accurate, and useful information about the performance of Michigan's public schools and students. The Center manages the state of Michigan's association with Standard & Poor's *School Evaluation Services* (SES). This Web-based report provides comparative evaluations of the fiscal, academic, and operational performance of Michigan's public school districts and public school academies.

The SES uses data provided by CEPI; MDE; The College Board; ACT, Inc.; National Center for Education Statistics, and the U.S. Department of Commerce. The analysis of the data is presented in 12- to 15-page summary reports entitled SES Observations.

Each Observation includes information about a school district's:

- Graduation and dropout rates and student performance on standardized tests (MEAP, PSAT, and SAT).
- Class and school sizes, staffing levels, technology, and safety conditions.
- Teacher salaries, per pupil state appropriations, how much and where districts are spending money, revenue sources, reserve levels, tax, and debt burdens.
- Demographic and community characteristics i.e., urban, mid-size city, small town, rural; populations; and number of adults with college degrees.

Michigan will use a similar format for the Uniform Management Information and Reporting System. Local educational agencies will submit data electronically to CEPI, who in turn, will analyze and publicly report data on a school-by-school basis by January 2003.

2. Incidence and Prevalence Data. Michigan plans to use the Michigan Substance Abuse Risk and Protective Factors 2000/2001 Student Survey

(Public School Results) and Michigan's Youth Risk Behavior Survey results as data sources by January 2003.

10. Title IV, Part A, Subpart 1, section 4112(a) -- Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities: Reservation of State Funds for the Governor [Goal 4]

- a. The Governor may reserve up to 20 percent of the State's allocation under this program to award competitive grants or contracts. Indicate the percentage of the State's allocation that is to be reserved for the Governor's program.

Michigan will utilize the entire 20% allocation for competitive grants or contracts.

- b. The Governor may administer these funds directly or designate an appropriate State agency to receive the funds and administer this allocation. Provide the name of the entity designated to receive these funds, contact information for that entity (the name of the head of the designated agency, address, telephone number), and the "DUNS" number that should be used to award these funds.

The Office of Drug Control Policy (within the Department of Community Health) has been designated as the entity to receive these funds.

Head of Designated Agency: Craig J. Yaldoo, Director
Office of Drug Control Policy
320 S. Walnut, 2nd Floor
Lansing, MI 48913

Contact Person: Judith M. Pasquarella
Office of Drug Control Policy
320 S. Walnut, 2nd Floor
Lansing, MI 48913

11. Title IV, Part A, Subpart 2, section 4126 -- Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities: Community Service Grants [Goal 4]

Describe how the SEA, after it has consulted with the Governor, will use program funds to develop and implement a community service program for suspended and expelled students.

The Community Service grants program is new. MDE will develop a plan in consultation with the Governor to apply for these funds and submit the specific information requested by September 1, 2002.

12. Title IV, Part B: 21st Century Community Learning Centers [Goals 1, 2, and 5]

Identify the percentage of students participating in 21st Century Community Learning Centers who meet or exceed the proficient level of performance on State assessments in reading and mathematics. The State must collect baseline data for the 2002-2003 school year, and submit all of these data to the Department no later than early September of 2003 by a date the Department will announce.

This information is not currently available. The State will collect the data during the 2002-2003 school year and submit it by September 2003. MDE will contract with a research entity to develop a comprehensive evaluation of the 21st CCLC initiative, focusing on improvements in student achievement.

13. Title V, Part A -- Innovative Programs [Any goal(s) selected by State]

- a. In accordance with section 5112(a)(1) of the ESEA, provide the SEA's formula for distributing program funds to LEAs. Include information on how the SEA will adjust its formula to provide higher per-pupil allocations to LEAs that have the greatest numbers or percentages of children whose education imposes a higher-than-average cost per child, such as –
 - i. Children living in areas with concentrations of economically disadvantaged families;
 - ii. Children from economically disadvantaged families; and
 - iii. Children living in sparsely populated areas.

The funding formula that was previously used for Title VI and will be used for Title V, Part A –Innovative programs provides higher per-pupil allocations to LEAs that have the greatest numbers or percentages of children whose education imposes a higher-than-average cost per child. Eighty percent of the funds are distributed based on counts of children from economically disadvantaged families who also live in areas with concentrations of economically disadvantaged families. Five percent of the funds are distributed based on children living in sparsely populated areas. The specific funding formula is as follows:

- Per Pupil Factor: All districts receive a basic per-pupil allocation based on the district's enrollment. 15% of Michigan's Title V funds will be distributed on a formula basis under this factor.
- Sparsity: Districts in which there are 6.5 or fewer students per square mile will receive high cost funds under this factor. 5% of MI's Title V funds are distributed on a formula basis under this factor.
- Low Income – Title I Factor: Districts in which the percentage of students are eligible under federal poverty criteria for compensatory education services under Title I of P.L. 103-382 exceeds the state average of students eligible for Title I will be eligible to receive high-cost funds under this factor. The number of eligible students will be weighted by a factor of 1.5 in districts where the percentage is more than double the state average. 40% of MI's Title V funds will be distributed on a formula basis under this factor.
- Low Income – Free Lunch Factor: This factor provides funds to districts if the percentage of students that qualify under federal guidelines for the National School

Lunch Act, 43 USC 1751, for free lunch is greater than the state average. The number of eligible students will be weighted by a factor of 1.5 in districts where the percentage is more than double the state average. 40% of MI's Title V funds will be distributed on a formula basis under this factor.

*Allocation Adjustment: Each local school district allocation is adjusted for the distribution of funds to their constituent intermediate school district (ISD) and regional educational media center (REMC). Consistent with the prior Chapter 2, then Title VI, and now Title V, Part A, program, the state application has identified resources for ISDs and REMCs to provide direct services to students. The local education agency allocations are adjusted as follows:

- 87.5% to public and nonprofit private schools
- 12.5% to ISDs—of which 2.5% is directed to all ISDs (57) with the remaining 10% to the ISDs (22) serving as fiscal agents for REMCs. ISDs also receive funds as a LEA on the basis of students enrolled in membership in the ISD.

- iv. Identify the amount or percentage the State will reserve for each State-level activity under section 5121, and describe the activity.

The state will reserve 15% for State-level activities. Of that, 2.5% will be targeted for administrative programs and 12.5% will be targeted for statewide activities.

*70% of the State-level activity funds will support statewide education reform, school improvement programs, technical assistance, and direct grants to local educational agencies that assist such agencies under section 5131.

*30% of the State-level activity funds will support the design and implementation of high-quality yearly student assessments, support for implementation of challenging State and local academic achievement standards, and support for arrangements that provide for independent analysis to measure and report on school district achievement.

Grant recipients will be provided an opportunity to partner with Michigan Virtual University as they plan activities supported by this program.

15. Title VI, Part B, Subpart 2 -- Rural and Low-Income School Program [Goals 1,2,3,5]

- b. Identify the SEA's specific measurable goals and objectives related to increasing student academic achievement; decreasing student dropout rates; or improvement in other educational factors the SEA may elect to measure, and describe how Rural and Low-Income School program funds will help the SEA meet the goals and objectives identified.
- c. Describe how the State elects to make awards under the Rural and Low-Income School Program:
 - i. By formula proportionate to the numbers of students in eligible districts;
 - ii. Competitively (please explain any priorities for the competition); or
 - iii. By a State-designed formula that results in equal or greater assistance being awarded to school districts that serve higher concentrations of

poor students.

(NOTE: If a State elects this option, the formula must be submitted for the Department's approval. States that elect this option may submit their State-designed formulas for approval as part of this submission.)

The MDE plans to make the decision as to how it will award funds under Title VI, Part B, Subpart 2 as soon as adequate information is available regarding the eligible districts and the amount of funds available. The MDE will elect to award funds by a formula proportionate to the numbers of students in eligible districts if this method results in district allocations that are large enough to help the affected districts support meaningful activities. If this is not the case, the MDE will design a formula that results in greater assistance to school districts that serve higher concentrations of poor students.

GEPA (General Education Provisions Act), Section 427

All applicants for new awards must include information in their applications to address GEPA, Section 427 in order to receive funding under this program. GEPA 427 requires a description of the steps the applicant proposes to take to ensure equitable access to, and participation in, its Federally assisted programs for students, teachers, and other program beneficiaries with special needs. For a State-formula grant program, a State needs to provide this description only for projects or activities that it carries out with funds reserved for State-level uses. In addition, local school districts or other eligible applicants that apply to the State for funding need to provide this description in their applications to the State for funding. The State would be responsible for ensuring that the school district or other local entity has submitted a sufficient section 427 to the State.

MDE believes that the barriers to equitable access to or participation in activities undertaken with funds from programs in this plan are being addressed through practices and strategies implemented to ensure equity in all programs. Historically, Michigan has been sensitive to equity needs and has responded with practices as listed below.

- Through the programs administered by MDE, there exists a variety of assurances, in different forms and at numerous levels, which guarantee equitable access for all students, parents, teachers, and other adults in the state to all state and federal programs.
- All preliminary local consolidated applications submitted to the MDE contain a statement describing the steps the applicant will take to ensure equitable access to, and participation in, each program included in the plan by addressing special needs of students, teachers, and other program beneficiaries to overcome barriers based on gender, race, color, national origin, limited English proficiency, disability, and age.
- All grant criteria and grant awards approved by the State Board of Education are required to contain a standard equity statement, which addresses any specific equity issues that relate to the grant.
- To ensure equity in distribution of grant funds, criteria for competitive grants awarded by the State Board of Education contain statements such as “grant

awards will be balanced geographically among urban, suburban, and rural districts.”

- The MDE website at www.michigan.gov/mde has been established to ensure that barriers to equitable participation resulting from geographic isolation are overcome.
- The Intermediate School Districts’ (57) and mathematics and science centers’ (33) structures are utilized to implement professional development plans with and for constituent local school districts to ensure equitable access to professional development programs and activities.
- The Michigan Education Assessment Program (MEAP) test scores are reported by gender and racial-ethnic group for use in school improvement planning. At the local level, it is also possible to report scores for other groups, such as special education and migrant pupils.

Consolidated Administrative Funds

1. Does the SEA plan to consolidate State-level administrative funds?

Yes, MDE plans to submit a waiver to allow for consolidation of State-level administrative funds.

Transferability

Does the State plan to transfer non-administrative State-level ESEA funds under the provisions of the State and Local Transferability Act (sections 6121 to 6123 of the ESEA)? If so, please list the funds and the amounts and percentages to be transferred, the program from which funds are to be transferred, and the program into which funds are to be transferred.

(Note: If the State elects to notify the Department of the transfer in this document, the State’s responses to the application’s requests for information should reflect the State’s comprehensive plan after the transfer. If the State has not elected to transfer funds at this time, it may do so at a later date. To do so, the State must (1) establish an effective date for the transfer, (2) notify the Department (at least 30 days before the effective date of the transfer) of its intention to transfer funds, and (3) submit the resulting changes to the information previously submitted in the State’s consolidated application by 30 days after the effective date of the transfer.)

At this time, the MDE has no plan to transfer funds. MDE will notify US ED 30 days in advance of making any transfer decisions.

ASSURANCES AND CERTIFICATIONS

The Consolidated State Application Signature Page, signed by the authorized State/SEA representative and **submitted in June 2002**, certifies the State's agreement to the following sets of assurances, the crosscutting certification, and the requirements of GEPA, Section 427.

General and Cross-Cutting Assurances

Section 9304(a) requires States to have on file with the Secretary a single set of assurances, applicable to each program included in the consolidated application, that provide that --

1. Each such program will be administered in accordance with all applicable statutes, regulations, program plans, and applications;
2. The control of funds provided under each such program and title to property acquired with program funds will be in a public agency, a nonprofit private agency, institution, or organization, or an Indian tribe, if the law authorizing the program provides for assistance to those entities; and
3. The public agency, nonprofit private agency, institution, or organization, or Indian tribe will administer those funds and property to the extent required by the authorizing law;
4. The State will adopt and use proper methods of administering each such program, including—
 - a. The enforcement of any obligations imposed by law on agencies, institutions, organizations, and other recipients responsible for carrying out each program;
 - b. The correction of deficiencies in program operations that are identified through audits, monitoring, or evaluation; and
 - c. The adoption of written procedures for the receipt and resolution of complaints alleging violations of law in the administration of the programs;
5. The State will cooperate in carrying out any evaluation of each such program conducted by or for the Secretary or other Federal officials;
6. The State will use such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as will ensure proper disbursement of, and accounting for, Federal funds paid to the State under each such program;
7. The State will—
 - a. Make reports to the Secretary as may be necessary to enable the Secretary to perform the Secretary's duties under each such program; and
 - b. Maintain such records, provide such information to the Secretary, and afford such access to the records as the Secretary may find necessary to carry out the Secretary's duties; and
 - c. Before the plan or application was submitted to the Secretary, the State afforded a reasonable opportunity for public comment on the plan or application and considered such comment.

Certification

Certification of Compliance with Unsafe School Choice Option Requirements

The State certifies that it has established and implemented a statewide policy requiring that students attending persistently dangerous public elementary or secondary schools, as determined by the State (in consultation with a representative sample of local educational agencies), or who become victims of violent criminal offenses, as determined by State law, while in or on the grounds of public elementary and secondary schools that the students attend, be allowed to attend safe public elementary or secondary schools within the local educational agency, including a public charter school.

To date, the state does not have a policy related to students attending persistently dangerous public elementary and secondary schools, as determined by State law. However, the Michigan Safe Schools Initiative committee, which meets on a regular basis, is currently addressing this issue. They will develop a policy by December 2002 that is consistent with current law and school practices established within Michigan. The committee includes representatives from The Education Alliance, police departments, offices of public safety, the Michigan Departments of Education, Community Health, Family Independence Agency, Attorney General, and State Police, law firms, higher education colleges of social work, criminal justice, extension service, the legislature, Center for Peace and Conflict Studies, Incident Management Team, Federation of Private Child and Family Agencies, Prosecuting Attorney Coordinating Council, Office of Drug Control Policy, and others.

ESEA Program Specific Assurances

Each SEA that submits a consolidated application also must provide an assurance that it will comply with all requirements of the ESEA programs included in their consolidated applications, whether or not the program statute identifies these requirements as a description or assurance that States would address, absent this consolidated application, in a program-specific plan or application. States are required to maintain records of their compliance with each of those requirements. (Note: For the Safe and Drug Free Schools programs, the SEA must have all appropriate assurances from the Governor on record.)

Through the general assurance and assurance (1) in section 9304 (a), the SEA agrees to comply with all requirements of the ESEA and other applicable program statutes. While all requirements are important, we have identified below a number of key requirements of each program that the SEA is agreeing to meet through this general assurance. This list of program-specific requirements the SEA is assuring is not exhaustive; States are accountable for all program requirements.

1. Title I, Part A – Improving Basic Programs Operated By LEAs

Assurance that –

- a. The State plan for the implementation of Title I, Part A was developed in

- consultation with LEAs, teachers, principals, pupil services personnel, administrators, other staff and parents and that the plan for Title I, Part A coordinates with other programs under this Act, the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Technical Education Act of 1998, the Head Start Act, the Adult Education and Family Literacy Act, and the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act.
- b. The SEA has a plan for assisting LEAs and schools to develop capacity to comply with program operation and for providing additional educational assistance to students needing help to achieve State standards, including:
 - i. the use of schoolwide programs;
 - ii. steps to ensure that both schoolwide program- and targeted assisted program schools have highly qualified staff (section 1111);
 - iii. ensuring that assessments results are used by LEAs, schools, and teachers to improve achievement (section 1111);
 - iv. use of curricula aligned with state standards (section 1111);
 - v. provision of supplemental services, including a list of approved service providers and standards and techniques for monitoring the quality and effectiveness of services (section 1116);
 - vi. choice and options (section 1116);
 - vii. the state support system under section 1117; and
 - viii. teacher and paraprofessional qualifications (section 1119).
 - c. The State has a strategy for ensuring that children served by Title I, Part A will be taught the same knowledge and skills in other subjects and held to the same expectations as all children.
 - d. The State will implement the accountability requirements of section 1116(f) regarding schools identified for improvement prior to the passage of NCLB.
 - e. The State will implement the provisions of section 1116 regarding LEAs and schools in improvement and corrective action.
 - f. The State will produce and disseminate an annual State Report Card in accordance with section 1111(h)(1) and will ensure that LEAs that receive Title I, Part A funds produce and disseminate annual local Report Cards in accordance with section 1111(h)(2).
 - g. The SEA will ensure that LEAs will annually assess English skills for all limited-English proficient students.
 - h. The SEA will coordinate with other agencies that provide services to children, youth and families to address factors that have significantly affected the achievement of students.
 - i. The SEA will ensure that assessment results are promptly provided to LEAs, schools, and teachers.
 - j. The State will participate in State academic assessments of 4th and 8th grade reading and mathematics under NAEP if the Secretary pays the cost of administering such assessments, and will ensure that schools drawn for the NAEP sample will participate in all phases of these assessments, including having results published.

- k. The SEA, in consultation with the Governor, will produce a plan for carrying out the responsibilities of the State under sections 1116 and 1117, and the SEA's statewide system for technical assistance and support of LEAs.
- l. The SEA will assist LEAs in developing or identifying high-quality curricula aligned with State academic achievement standards and will disseminate such curricula to each LEA and local school within the State.
- m. The State will carry out the assurances specified in section 1111(c).

1. Title I, Part B – Even Start Family Literacy

Assurance that –

- a. The SEA will meet its indicators of program quality developed in section 1240.
- b. The SEA will help each project under this part to fully implement the program elements described in section 1235, including the monitoring of the projects' compliance with staff qualification requirements and usage of instructional programs based on scientifically based reading research for children and adults.
- c. The SEA collaborated with early childhood specialists, adult education specialists, and others at the State and local level with interests in family literacy in the development and implementation of this plan.

2. Title I, Part C – Education of Migrant Children

Assurance that –

In addition to meeting the seven program assurances in Section 1304(c), the SEA will ensure that –

- a. Special educational needs of migratory children, including preschool migratory children, are identified and addressed through – (a) the full range of services that are available for migratory children from appropriate local, State, and Federal educational programs; (b) joint planning among local, State, and Federal educational programs serving migrant children, including language instruction educational programs under part A or B of title III; and (c) the integration of services available under this part with services provided by those other programs, a (d) measurable program goals and outcomes.
- b. State and its local operating agencies will identify and address the special educational needs of migratory children in accordance with a comprehensive State plan as specified in section 1306 (a).
- c. State will provide for educational continuity through the timely transfer of pertinent school records in a manner consistent with procedures the Secretary may require.

4. Title I, Part D – Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent or At-Risk

Assurance that the SEA –

- a. Will ensure that programs will be carried out in accordance with the State plan.

- b. Will carry out the evaluation requirements of section 1431.
- c. Has collaborated with parents, correctional facilities, local education agencies, public and private business and other state and federal technical and vocational programs in developing and implementing its plan to meet the educational needs of neglected, delinquent, and at-risk children and youth.
- d. Conducts a process to award Subpart 2 subgrants, to programs operated by local education agencies and correctional facilities.
- e. Will integrate programs and services for neglected, delinquent, and at-risk children and youth with other programs under this Act or other Acts.

5. Title I, Part F – Comprehensive School Reform

Assurance that the SEA will –

- a. Fulfill all requirements relating to the competitive subgranting of program funds.
- b. Awards subgrants of not less than \$50,000 and of sufficient size and scope to support the initial costs of the program.
- c. Award subgrants renewable for 2 additional one year periods if the school is making substantial progress.
- d. Consider the equitable distribution of subgrants to different geographic regions in the State, including urban and rural areas and to schools serving elementary and secondary students.
- e. Reserve not more than five (5) percent of grant funds for administrative, evaluation, and technical assistance expenses.
- f. Use funds to supplement, and not supplant, any other funds that would otherwise be available to carry out these activities.
- g. Report subgrant information, including names of LEAs and schools, amount of award, and description of award.
- h. Provide a copy of the State's annual program evaluation.

6. Title II, Part A – Teacher and Principal Training and Recruiting Fund

Assurance that –

- a. The SEA will take steps to ensure compliance with the requirements for “professional development” as the term is defined in section 9101(34).
- b. All funded activities will be developed collaboratively and based on the input of teachers, principals, administrators, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel.
- c. The SEA will implement the provisions for technical assistance and accountability in section 2141 with regard to any LEA that has failed to make adequate yearly progress for two or more consecutive years.

7. Title II, Part D – Enhanced Education Through Technology

Assurance that the SEA –

- a. Will ensure that each subgrant awarded under section 2412 (a)(2)(B) is of sufficient size and duration, and that the program funded by the subgrant is of sufficient scope and quality, to carry out the purposes of this part effectively.
- b. Has in place a State Plan for Educational Technology that meets all of the provisions of section 2413 of ESEA.

8. Title III, Part A – English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement

Assurance that –

- a. Subgrantees will be required to use their subgrants to build their capacity to continue to provide high-quality language instruction educational programs for LEP students once the subgrants are no longer available.
- b. The State will consult with LEAs, education-related community groups and non-profit organizations, parents, teachers, school administrators, and researchers in developing annual measurable student achievement objectives for subgrantees.
- c. Each subgrantee will include in its plan a certification that all teachers in a Title III language instruction educational program for limited English proficient children are fluent in English and any other language used for instruction.
- d. In awarding subgrants to eligible entities that have experienced a recent significant increase in the percentage or number of immigrant students, the State will equally consider eligible entities that have limited or no experience in serving immigrant children and youth, and consider the quality of each local plan.
- e. Subgrants will be of sufficient size and scope to support high-quality programs.
- f. Subgrantees will be required to provide for an annual reading or language arts assessment in English of all children who have been in the United States for three or more consecutive years.
- g. Subgrantees will be required to assess annually the English proficiency of all LEP children.
- h. A subgrantee plan will not be in violation of any State law, including State constitutional law, regarding the education of LEP children.
- i. Subgrantee evaluations will be used to determine and improve the effectiveness of subgrantee programs and activities.
- j. Subgrantee evaluations will include a description of the progress made by children in meeting State academic content and student academic achievement standards for each of the two years after these children no longer participate in a Title III language instruction educational program.
- k. A subgrantee that fails to make progress toward meeting annual measurable achievement objectives for two consecutive years will be required to develop an improvement plan that will ensure the subgrantee meets those objectives.
- l. Subgrantees will be required to provide the following information to parents of LEP children selected for participation in a language instruction educational program:

- 1) How the program will meet the educational needs of their children;
 - 2) Their options to decline to enroll their children in that program or to choose another program, if available;
 - 3) If applicable, the failure of the subgrantee to make progress on the annual measurable achievement objectives for their children.
- m. In awarding subgrants, the State will address the needs of school systems of all sizes and in all geographic areas within the State, including school systems with urban and rural schools.

9. Title IV, Part A – Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities

Assurance that –

- a. The State has developed a comprehensive plan for the use of funds by the State educational agency and the chief executive officer of the State to provide safe, orderly, and drug-free schools and communities through programs and activities that complement and support activities of local educational agencies under section 4115(b), that comply with the principles of effectiveness under section 4115(a), and that otherwise are in accordance with the purpose of this part.
- b. Activities funded under this program will foster a safe and drug-free learning environment that supports academic achievement.
- c. The application was developed in consultation and coordination with appropriate State officials and others, including the chief executive officer, the chief State school officer, the head of the State alcohol and drug abuse agency, the heads of the State health and mental health agencies, the head of the State child welfare agency, the head of the State board of education, or their designees, and representatives of parents, students, and community-based organizations.
- d. Funds reserved under section 4112(a) will not duplicate the efforts of the State education agency and local educational agencies with regard to the provisions of school-based drug and violence prevention activities and that those funds will be used to serve populations not normally served by the State educational agencies and local educational agencies and populations that need special services, such as school dropouts, suspended and expelled students, youth in detention centers, runaway or homeless children and youth, and pregnant and parenting youth.
- e. The State will cooperate with, and assist, the Secretary in conducting data collection as required by section 4122.
- f. LEAs in the State will comply with the provisions of section 9501 pertaining to the participation of private school children and teachers in the programs and activities under this program.
- g. Funds under this program will be used to increase the level of State, local, and other non-Federal funds that would, in the absence of funds under this subpart, be made available for programs and activities authorized under this program, and in no case supplant such State, local, and other non-Federal funds.

- h. A needs assessment was conducted by the State for drug and violence prevention programs, which shall be based on ongoing State evaluation activities, including data on the incidence and prevalence of illegal drug use and violence among youth in schools and communities, including the age of onset, the perception of health risks, and the perception of social disapproval among such youth, the prevalence of protective factors, buffers, or assets and other variables in the school and community identified through scientifically based research.
- i. The State will develop and implement procedures for assessing and publicly reporting progress toward meeting the performance measures.
- j. The State application will be available for public review after submission of the application.
- k. Special outreach activities will be carried out by the SEA and the chief executive officer of the State to maximize the participation of community-based organizations of demonstrated effectiveness that provide services such as mentoring programs in low-income communities.
- l. Funds will be used by the SEA and the chief executive officer of the State to support, develop, and implement community-wide comprehensive drug and violence prevention planning and organizing activities.
- m. The State will develop a process for review of applications from local educational agencies that includes receiving input from parents.

10. Title IV, Part B – 21st Century Community Learning Centers

Assure that the SEA will –

- a. Write the State application in consultation and coordination with appropriate State officials, including the chief State school officer, and other State agencies administering before and after school programs, the heads of the State health and mental health agencies or their designees, and representatives of teachers, parents, students, the business community, and community-based organizations.
- b. Award subgrants of not less than three years and not more than five years that are of not less than \$50,000 and of sufficient size and scope to support high quality, effective programs.
- c. Fund entities that propose to serve students who primarily attend schools eligible for schoolwide programs under section 1114 or schools that serve a high percentage of students from low-income families, and the families of such students.
- d. Require local applicants to submit a plan describing how community-learning centers to be funded through this grant will continue after the grant period.
- e. Require local applicants to describe in their applications how the transportation needs of participating students will be addressed.

11. Title V, Part A – Innovative Programs

Assure that –

- a. The State has set forth the allocation of funds required to implement section 5142 (participation of children enrolled in private schools).
- b. The State has made provision for timely public notice and public dissemination of the information concerning allocations of funds required to implement provisions for assistance to students attending private schools.
- c. Apart from providing technical and advisory assistance and monitoring compliance with this part, the SEA has not exercised, and will not exercise, any influence in the decision making processes of LEAs as to the expenditure made pursuant to the LEAs' application for program funds submitted under section 5133.

Appendix A

Abbreviations and Acronyms Used in Michigan’s Consolidated State Application

AAAC – Alternate Assessment Committee
ACT—American College Test
ASAP-PIE – All Students Achieve Program – Parent Involvement and Education
AYP – Annual Yearly Progress
CAC – Content Advisory Committee
CCLC – 21st Century Community Learning Centers
CEPI – The Center for Educational Performance and Information
CSR – Comprehensive School Reform
CSRД – Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration program
DCD – Department of Career Development
EDP – Education Development Plan
ELL-Access – English Language Learner Alternate Assessment
ELP – English Language Proficient
FIA – Family Independence Agency
FID – Financial Information Database
GED—General Education Diploma
IHE – Institution of Higher Education
IDEA – Individuals with Disabilities Act
IEPT – Individualized Education Planning Team
IMEC – Interstate Migrant Education Council
IMSC – Interagency Migrant Services Committee
ISD – Intermediate School District
LEA – Local Education Agency
LEP – Limited English proficiency
LQM – last qualifying move
MASA – Michigan Association of Schools Administrators
MASSP – Michigan Association of Secondary School Principals
MBLEE – Michigan Business Leaders for Excellence in Education
MDCH – Michigan Department of Community Health
MDE – Michigan Department of Education
MDT – Michigan Department of Treasury
MEA – Michigan Education Association
MEAP – Michigan Education Assessment Program
MEDS – Migrant Education Database System
MEIS – Michigan Education Information System
MEMSPA – Michigan Elementary and Middle School Principals Association
MEP – Migrant Education Program
MFT – Michigan Federation of Teachers
MI-Access – Michigan’s Alternate Assessment Program
MLPP – Michigan Literacy Performance Profile
MSHDA – Michigan State Housing Development Authority
MSRP – Michigan School Readiness Program

MTIP – Michigan Technology Implementation Project
MVU – Michigan Virtual University
NCLB – No Child Left Behind
ODCP – Office of Drug Control Policy
OFS – Office of Field Services
OSE-EIS – Office of Special Education and Early Childhood Services
PD – professional development
PIT – Crew – Putting It Together with Michigan Families
PSA – Public School Academy
PSAT—Preliminary Scholastic Aptitude Test
PTA – Parent Teachers Association
QAR – Quality Assurance Review
REMC – Regional Education Media Center
REP – Registry of Education Personnel
RFP – Request for Proposal
RMC 2002 – Corporation on contract with Even Start
SCANS – Secretary’s Commission on Achieving Necessary Skills
SDFSC – Safe and Drug Free Schools and Communities
SBE – State Board of Education
SEA – State Education Agency
SES – School Evaluation Services
SID – School Infrastructure Database
SRSD – Single Student Record Database
STAR – Student Test and Achievement Registry
S.Y. – School Year
TAC – Technical Advisory Committee
UIC – unique identifying code
UMIRS – Uniform Management Information and Reporting System

Appendix B

URLs used to link to specific program information

Michigan's Curriculum Framework:

http://www.michigan.gov/documents/MichiganCurriculumFramework_8172_7.pdf

The 2001-2002 Summary Language By Grade report:

http://www.michigan.gov/documents/qrySummaryLangByGradeW_35298_7.PDF

Even Start Family Literacy RFP:

http://www.michigan.gov/documents/REVISED_ES_Continuation_Application_4-02_1_29167_7.pdf

Comprehensive School Reform RFP:

http://www.michigan.gov/mde/1,1607,7-140-6525_6530_6559-21417--,00.html

Safe and Drug Free Schools and Communities (Title IV, Part A, section 4112) RFP:

http://www.michigan.gov/documents/Jan18_Final_GDG_Application_1_29172_7.pdf

Office of Field Service's Program descriptions:

http://www.michigan.gov/documents/OFS_Operationalizing_29155_7.pdf

Link to Putting It Together with Michigan Families (PIT Crew) website:

<http://www.mdch.state.mi.us/pit/pit.htm>

Comprehensive School Reform (CSR) proposal:

http://www.michigan.gov/mde/1,1607,7-140-6525_6530_6559-21417--,00.html

Michigan's State Technology Plan (1998) Update 2000:

http://www.michigan.gov/documents/Michigan_Tech_Plan_2000_35342_7.pdf

MDE's Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with Michigan Virtual University (MVU): http://www.michigan.gov/documents/MVU_MOU_final_draft_35297_7.doc

Appendix C

Fiscal Awards

Projected Funding For NCLB 2002-03 (\$ in millions)

| Funding for Selected Education Programs | Michigan in 2001-02 | Michigan in 2002-03 |
|--|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| Title I (Basic Grants) | \$359.4 | \$413.79 |
| Even Start | \$8.7 | \$8.77 |
| Reading First State Grants | \$0 | \$28.47 |
| Migrant Education | \$8.96 | \$9.35 |
| Comprehensive School Reform | \$10.43 | \$11.7 |
| Improving Teacher Quality State Grants | \$0 | \$110.07 |
| Safe and Drug-Free Schools | \$13 | \$16.44 |
| 21st Century Learning Centers | \$0 | \$11.75 |
| Community Service for Expelled/Suspended Youth | \$0 | \$1.79 |
| State and Local Technology Grants | \$0 | \$23.76 |
| Language Instruction for LEP Students | \$0 | \$4.89 |
| Innovation Program State Grants | \$13.63 | \$13.63 |
| Charter Schools | \$6.55 | \$9 |
| Charter Education | \$0.26 | \$0.25 |
| Rural and Low Income School Program | \$0 | \$2.01 |
| Education of Homeless Children and Youth | \$1.39 | \$1.96 |